

# THE ARSHAMA LETTERS FROM THE BODLEIAN LIBRARY



Volume 3

COMMENTARY

Christopher Tuplin

December 2013

*The Arshama Letters from the Bodleian Letters*

Vol. 1 Introduction

Vol. 2 Text, translation and glossary

Vol. 3 Commentary

Vol. 4. Abbreviations and Bibliography

Available for download at <http://arshama.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/publications/>

*The Arshama Letters from the Bodleian Library* by L. Allen, J. Ma, C. J. Tuplin, D. G. K. Taylor is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License



This work takes its origin in activities funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council; more at <http://arshama.classics.ox.ac.uk>.



Arts & Humanities  
Research Council

Cover: Pell. Aram. 1 (A6.10). Photography courtesy of the Bodleian Library.

## CONTENTS

Commentary	1-127
Appendix 1: Letter subscripts	128-135
Appendix 2: The Fall and Rise of the Elephantine Temple	136-151

### A6.3 = Driver 3 = Grelot 64 = Lindenberger 39

#### Punishment of slaves of ‘Ankhoḥapi

##### Summary

Arshama writes to Artavanta giving instructions for the punishment of eight slaves belonging to ‘Ankhoḥapi. This arises because Psamshek son of ‘Ankhoḥapi (Arshama’s servant) has reported that, when he went to Arshama, the slaves of his father took his property and fled. He has asked Arshama to ask Artavanta to punish the slaves that he (Psamshek) presents before him. Arshama therefore issues the requested instruction.

##### Date

None given.

##### Text

The Porten-Yardeni text in TADAE I differs from Driver’s in incorporating fr.7.1. See below, notes on lines 1, 2. There are also some further relevant fragments identified in TADAE IV. See below, notes on lines 3-4, 5. As noted there, Lindenberger, while drawing attention the information in TADAE IV, incorporates it in his text and/or translation somewhat inconsistently. His text also differs slightly from Porten-Yardeni in lines 2,6,7,9 in his judgment of where the square brackets marking the start or end of a lacuna should be placed. This does not affect the text that he actually prints (which matches Porten-Yardeni). This phenomenon is a regular feature of his edition and normally involves putting more letters inside square bracket than is the case in Porten-Yardeni. Lindenberger is also more prone to mark individual letters as damaged, though reasonably certain.

line 1 *mn ’Ršm ’l ’Rtwnt*, “from Aršama to Artavanta”. The principle seems to be that the more important party is mentioned first, irrespective of whether that is the sender (as in A6.2 and throughout A6.3-16) or the receiver, as in A6.1, which starts [*’l mr’n ’Rš]m ’bdyk ’Ḥmnš wknwih*, “to our lord Arshama, your servants Achaemenes and his colleagues”. In most contexts, of course, if sender and recipient are not of markedly different status, the sender politely affects to ascribe higher status to the recipient, which is why Egyptian Aramaic letters standardly begin “To PN”. Almost all the Bactrian letters begin “From PN<sub>1</sub> to PN<sub>2</sub>”. This is unremarkable in letters from the satrap Akhvamazda (ADAB A1-6), but interestingly it is true of most of the other letters too (B1-4,6), with only B5, “[To] my l[ord ... I send] to you [much peace and strength]” working the other way. Perhaps the writers of B1-4 and B6 were all more important than their addressees: we know nothing of them that can determine this one way or another. The fact that their addressees are regularly described as “my brother” (only B2 does not have this feature) and are always accorded a polite greeting (as, of course, Artavanta is by Arshama) are not necessarily counter-indications.<sup>1</sup>

line 1 *’Ršm*, “Aršama”. Neither Arshama nor any of his correspondents ever refers to him as “satrap”. He is “Arshama who is in Egypt” (A6.1, A6.2) or (extremely tantalisingly) “Arsames who is in Egypt as [...]” (P.Mainz 17)<sup>2</sup> or “lord” or “son of the house”. This is

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that in Neo-Babylonian letter-writing superiors in a temple setting address subordinates (as well as equals) as “brothers” not “servants” (Kleber 2012, 228).

<sup>2</sup> It is preceded by a regnal date (year 36 of, presumably, Artaxerxes I), producing an effect resembling the Mylasan inscription I.Mylasa 1-3 = SIG<sup>3</sup> 167 = RO 54, the Lydian (funerary?) text in Gusmani & Akkan 2004 (starting with the 17<sup>th</sup> year of Artaxerxes and the satrap Rhosaces) and the

unremarkable. The term “satrap” is far from omnipresent even in Greek sources and decidedly rare in Persian and the other non-Greek languages of the empire. (It does not occur, for example, in the Bactrian Aramaic letters, leaving us strictly speaking unsure of the status of Akhvamazda.) In Egypt a demotic version of the word appears on a Saqqara ostrakon (S.75/6-7:2), apparently in reference to the Petisis of Arrian 3.5.2,<sup>3</sup> and in the text on the *verso* of the Demotic Chronicle that recounts Darius’ commissioning of a collection of Egyptian laws, but otherwise (apparent) holders of the office are referred to as “to whom Egypt is entrusted” (P.Berlin 13539-13540) or “lord of Egypt” (P.Rylands IX 2.17) or (perhaps) “the great one who ruled Egypt”.<sup>4</sup> The low incidence of official use of the title might have some bearing on the sparseness of its use in Greek sources before the fourth century.

line 1 ‘l, “to”. The use of ‘l, rather than ‘l, in letter addresses is characteristic of the Bodleian letters, but not other Egyptian Aramaic letters, where ‘l is universal (except for A2.4:1 and A6.2:1) – despite the fact that, in general, ‘l = “to” is avoided in Egyptian Aramaic. In ADAB ‘l is standard in the first line of the letter, but ‘l is used in the *external* address line (ADAB A1.13, A3.5, A4.7, A5.4, A6.12). This oddity, and the occurrence of ‘l in A6.2 (written in Egypt), suggest that the contrast between the Bodleian letters and the generality of Egyptian Aramaic letters is not simply a matter of where the letters written (as Alexander 1978 supposed), but may be something to do with official conventions. (Note also its appearance in Ezra 4.11,17.)

line 1 ‘Rtwnt, “Artavanta”. Iranian \*Rtavanta- (“righteous”): Tavernier 2007, 303, the equivalent of Greek Artayntes or Artontes. Various written in Aramaic as ‘Rthnt (A6.7, D6.4 fr.[f]) – the use of H for /V/ is “exceptional” (Tavernier) but “represents a linguistic development of late Old Persian / early Middle Persian” (Elizabeth Tucker [personal communication]) - and ‘Rtwnt (A6.3, 6.4, 6.5, D6.4 [fr.g]). (There can be no doubt that the same person is designated by these two spellings.) He never has a title, but is addressed respectfully by Arshama,<sup>5</sup> and must be of substantial standing (Grelot 1972, 300: “haut personnage”). Driver thought he was approximately equal in rank to Arshama and perhaps acting temporarily as his representative in charge of Egyptian affairs (1965, 13); and, although it is unclear whether he meant this to include state/political affairs (i.e. that he was a temporary/deputy satrap), some have certainly supposed that to be the case. Fried 2004, 91 postulates that Artavanta was Arsames’ hyparch and garrison commander in Memphis; but there is no specific cause to say that – i.e. to put him firmly in the “public” sphere, let alone propose such precise official roles. Whitehead, while acknowledging that Artavanta’s status is a puzzle (and not including him in a table of authority in estate administration: 1974, 23), remarks that A6.7 suggests that he has “authority even over Arsames’ enemies” (1974, 20 n.1): that sounds exciting, but is misleading. We must (or we certainly can) assume that, so far as the Mispheh Thirteen are concerned at any rate, Arshama’s enemies have been worsted: Artavanta simply has authority in the ensuing situation. More generally, he is involved in cases of e.g. domain-assignment(A6.4) and punishment (A6.3) or

---

Aramaic version of the Xanthos trilingual (the Greek and Lycian versions omit the regnal date): FdX 6.136; [www.achemenet.com/pdf/arameens/lycie01](http://www.achemenet.com/pdf/arameens/lycie01).

<sup>3</sup> The belief that it occurs in S.H5-450 (cf. Tavernier 2007, 436) must be abandoned: cf. Smith & Martin 2010, 51-53. The correct reading is *Hšsry* (? = OP \*Xšaçariya, a personal name).

<sup>4</sup> Such, at least, is Menu’s understanding of this phrase in one of its occurrences in the Wn-nfr = Onnophris stela: cf. Menu 2008, 157.

<sup>5</sup> On one occasion he is the recipient of what, formulaically speaking, seems to be an especially polite greeting: cf. A6.7:1 n. It may be another aspect of Arshama’s politeness to him that the external addresses of letters to Artavanta describe Arshama as *br byt*, whereas this title is never used in the external addresses of letters to *pqydyn*.

non-punishment (A6.7) that go beyond the normal authority of the *pqyd* (or, in the case of A6.3, *pqyd* family-member) but still lie essentially within the purview of estate business.<sup>6</sup> Letters to Artavanta lack subscription formulae: in some sense, then, they are in a different realm of the bureaucratic process – but what that signifies remains debatable, given that letters that *do* have subscription formulae are also essentially concerned with estate business. (See Appendix I.) Elsewhere I have speculated that Artavanta was (to use Babylonian terminology) Arshama’s *mār biti* (see Introduction pp.21-25). Another theoretical possibility is that he was his son.

line 1 *šlm...lk*, “I send you...strength”. Among Persian addressors the use or non-use of greetings formulae plainly reflects relative status. There are no greetings from Arshama to Nakhtḥor (A6.10-13), Armapiya (A6.8), the Mesopotamian and Levantine *pqydn* (A6.9) or Waḥpremaḥi (A6.2) or from Varuvahya or Virafsha to Nakhtḥor (A6.14-15) or from Akhvamazda to Bagavant (ADAB A1-6), because the recipients are evidently too inferior. Artavanta, by contrast, is greeted by Arshama (A6.3-7) and Nakhtḥor by Artahaya (A6.16). Similarly most PFT letters lack greetings formulae, but we do find “may your *širi* be made by the gods and the King” (i.e. “may your wishes be fulfilled by the gods and the king”) in a subclass of letters written on rectangular tablets and sent among officials of equal status or from officials to superiors (PF 1832, PF 1857-1860, PF 2079, PFNN 0394, PFNN 0702, PFNN 2544). Persian greeting of one’s superior is attested in the Aramaic environment in A6.1 (Achaemenes and others to Arshama). Given Arshama’s high status, Artavanta’s receipt of a greeting is in the circumstances quite striking. So too is Nakhtḥor’s receipt of a greeting from Artahaya, considering that the latter was Persian and (apparently) complaining about Nakhtḥor’s actions.

All the greetings formulae in the Bodleian Arshama archive can essentially be paralleled elsewhere (references to “peace” [*šlm*] occur *passim*;<sup>7</sup> the “I send” trope recurs in A2.4, A2.7, A3.3, A3.4, A3.8, D7.1, D7.21 [CG 70], D7.22, ADAB B1-4, B6) and there are some rather close parallels.

- “I send you much peace and strength”: A6.3, A6.4 (Arshama to Artavanta), A6.16 (Artahaya to Nakhtḥor). Also in ADAB B1, B2, B5 (restored), A3.8 (Hosea to Ḥaggus). A2.4, A3.3, A3.4 differ only in omitting “much”.
- “I send you much peace and strength. And now there is peace with me in this place; may there also be peace there before you”: A6.5, A6.7 (Arshama to Artavanta). Also in ADAB B3, B4, B6. See also A6.7:1 n.
- “I send you much peace and strength. Here for me there is peace; may the gods appoint peace also there for you”: A6.6 (Arshama to Artavanta).<sup>8</sup> The second part (“and now...peace”) recalls A3.7, A4.2 (where the elements are in the reverse order) and A4.4. But instead of “seek after” (*yšlw* or *yš’lw*), which occurs in A3.7, A4.2 and A4.4 (as well

<sup>6</sup> A6.11, addressed to Nakhtḥor, Kenzasirma and colleagues is about land (*bgh*) assignment. But what differentiates A6.4 is that it concerns the assignment of a *dšn* to the *pqyd* himself. There is perhaps a similar issue of potential conflict of interest in A6.3 on top of the possibility that Psamshek is not yet *pqyd*. A6.7 deals with circumstances (treachery in a time of rebellion) sufficiently serious to exceed the *pqyd*’s authority.

<sup>7</sup> It is the irreducible minimum one word greeting in many ostrakon letters (D7.2, D7.3, D7.4, D7.8, D7.10, D7.11, D7.16, D7.20, D7.28, D7.31, D7.32, D7.34, D7.35). D7.5-6 have *šlmky* or *šlkm*. The letters in *Ezra* have either no greeting (4.8-16) or *šlm* (7.17) or *šlm kl’* (5.7). Other relatively abbreviated *šlm*-formulae include “I send you peace” (D7.1), “the peace of my brother at all times” (D7.56-57: verb definitely absent).

<sup>8</sup> “...that the gods shall appoint peace for you” recurs at A6.16:5, at the *end* of a letter.

as being apparently standard in many other similar references to the gods: A1.1, A3.5-6, A3.10-11, A4.1, A4.3, A4.7//A4.8, A5.6, A6.1<sup>9</sup>), we have “appoint” (*yšmw*).

The Bodleian letters generally avoid putting the gods into a greeting formula: the exception is A6.6. The gods also appear in the greeting of Achaemenes and his colleagues *to* Arshama in A6.1. This reflects the fact that the addressors in that case are using a formula-type (“may God/the gods seek after the peace...”) that occurs (either more or less exactly<sup>10</sup> or with further extension<sup>11</sup>) in many other letters from Elephantine Jews and others (e.g. the Iranian Spentadata). In truth, it is the norm for the gods<sup>12</sup> to be mentioned (the other main relevant trope in use being “I bless you by DN”): the letters of Arshama and Akhvamazda are matched by far fewer external items.

Driver 1965, 44 thought that the “I send you...” trope had a Persian origin (in this following Rosenthal 1939, 27 n.3), with analogies in Sasanian period (Henning 1954, 477f). If so, use is not confined to Persians. (See A2.4, A2.7, A3.3-4, D7.1, D7.21 [CG 70], D7.22.) In D7.21 the trope is directly combined with the “I bless you by DN” formula found also in A2.1-6 and in slightly different form in A3.3; and in A2.4 and A3.3 the two tropes both occur, but in introductions to separate sections of the letter [A2.4] or in a sort of second start [A3.3].) Driver 1965, 52 also cited a Phoenician turn-of-phrase (“if you are well, I am well”, *wšlm ’t ’p ’nk šlm*: Aimé-Giron 1941, 442-3 = KAI 50) as a parallel for the second part of the formula used in A6.5 and A6.7 (as well as ADAB B3, B4 and B6); but the parallel does not seem particularly close.<sup>13</sup> (It precedes a version of the “I bless you by DN” formula.)

line 1 *šlm...šrrt*, “peace...strength”. Note the alliteration. On word-plays cf. A6.12:2 n.

line 1 *w[k’t]*, “and [now]”. A certain restoration, in the light of what is found *passim* in the Bodleian corpus as a marker at the start of the body of a letter (i.e. after internal address and greeting). Elsewhere *wk’n* (A2.7:2), *k’n* (A4.7:4) or *k’nt* (A4.2:2) occasionally perform this function,<sup>14</sup> but this never happens in the Bodleian letters or in those from Bactria. This favour for *wk’t* is in line with TADAE I letters as a whole, in which *wk’t* (or occasionally *k’t*: A3.1v:2, A3.3:3, A3.9:1, A4.8:3) is the favoured opener. So what might be regarded as “official” texts (the Bodleian letters, TADAE A61-2, ADAB A1-10) are not out of line with other papyrus and parchment letters, and the presence of *wk’t* in both Akhvamazda’s and other writers’ letters in ADAB is in line too. (*w*)*k’n* is also not common in the Bodleian corpus at later points in the main body of a letter: it turns up in only three documents (A6.3:5, A6.7:8, A6.10:3,5),<sup>15</sup> whereas there are seven with *k’t* (A6.3:6, A6.6:4, A6.8:2, A6.11:3,

<sup>9</sup> I say apparently, because there *is* an element of restoration in some of these cases.

<sup>10</sup> A3.5-6, A3.9-11, A4.1. D7.56-57 give an abbreviated version (“the peace of my brother at all times”). CG 167, 186, 277 (= D7.30) are versions that name specific gods.

<sup>11</sup> A1.1, A3.7, A4.2-4, A4.7//A4.8, A5.3. The most extravagant extension, that of the Jewish addressors in A4.7//8, nonetheless contains elements that have analogies in A4.3 and A5.3. A4.3 is addressed to the addressors of A4.7 by other Jews, and the greetings formula may reflect those addressors’ high status in the Jewish community. A5.3 is addressed to an otherwise unknown, but potentially very important, Persian. Whether the fact that the writers wish the addressees favour variously before the God of Heaven (A4.3) and “Darius and the sons of the house” (A4.7//A4.8) is tantamount to conferring the allure of divinity upon the Persian King and the sons of the house is a moot point. (On “sons of the house” see Introduction pp.21-25.)

<sup>12</sup> Several times unambiguously with a plurality of gods, even when the writers are Jews.

<sup>13</sup> Whitehead was unpersuaded by Driver’s claim in both cases (1974, 254; 1978, 134).

<sup>14</sup> Note that *wk’n* in A4.7:4 was changed to *wk’t* in A4.8:3

<sup>15</sup> In A6.3:5 *k’n* is actually within a message that is being quoted by the letter-writer.

A6.13:4, A6.14:2, A6.15:3,6,9).<sup>16</sup> A6.1-2 also use *k't*, not *k'n*, within the main body of the letter; and there are actually few examples of medial *k'n* in TADAE I as a whole, helped by the facts that (i) most A3 letters have *no* medial marker-words of this sort (A3.3 is the exception – and it uses *k't*, repeatedly) and (ii) the early Hermopolis letters (A2) all use *wk't* again (not *k't*) in the body of the letter. But in the Bactrian letters things are rather the other way round, i.e. there are more medial uses of *k'n* than *k't* – though the uses of *k'n* are not quite like those in the Bodleian letters, and it is the letters from people other than Akhvamazda that produce most of the relevant items. In the epistolary material represented (mostly on ostraca) in Saqqara, CG and TADAE IV, (*w*)*k't* is rather rare (CG 30, 240; D1.1, D1.3, D1.15, D1.32, D7.31, D7.41, D7.56, D7.57), *k'n* extremely common (118 letters), and *k'nt* (encountered only once in TADAE I, at A4.4:2) appears in 31 letters.<sup>17</sup> The battered and fragmentary state of much of this material makes complex analysis difficult; but even the raw figures suggest that the preference for *k't* initially and medially in the Bodleian corpus, though in line with papyrus letters from Egypt, are out of line with more informal epistolary practice in Egypt. The Bactrian material, taken as a whole, is somewhere between the two, though Akhvamazda's own letters broadly (if not altogether in detail) resemble Arshama's in this matter.<sup>18</sup>

line 1 *Psmšk*, “Psamšek”. Egyptian *p3-s(-n)+mšk* (DN 212), Greek Ψαμμήτιχος. A Saite royal name (and an example of a relatively rare phenomenon, a personal name that does not include a theonym or recycle a divine epithet) also found outside the Bodleian letters (where the present individual recurs in A6.4:2,4, A6.8 *passim*, A6.10:1 [in the form *Smšk*], A6.15:2,4, D6.3a:6, D6.3b:1, D6.6m:1, and two different ones in A6.3:4) in B4.3:24, B4.4:20, B8.4:10, C3.8IIIB:12, C3.18:4, C4.1:4, C4.3:11, C4.9:2, D9.10:8, D11.1:1, D23.1.5A:5,6, Saqqara 11:5, 60:3, 64b:2. -- There is no necessity to think Psamshek is already *pqyd* (cf. below, notes on lines 5, 6), and we should probably assume that that office is still held by ‘Ankhoḥapi (A6.4:2). So Whitehead 1974, 21. Contrast Grelot 1972, 304, who assumes that Psamshek is now *pqyd* and that the slaves are described as Ankhoḥapi's because they were tattooed with his name. The word *pqyd* does not appear at all in Porten's text (cf. note below). We do not therefore need to debate whether PN1 *šmh br* PN2 *pqyd zyly* attaches *pqyd* to PN1 or PN2.

line 1 *Psmšk šmh*, “(he) whose name is Psamšek”. Putting *šmh* (= “his name”) after a PN was attributed to Persian influence by Driver – a view he then retracted in the *corrigenda* (1965, 99) – and by Whitehead, who noted that it is only a feature of Imperial Aramaic, considered both Persian and Egyptian influence possible, but favoured Persian. Possible counter-arguments are that Aramaic “his name” is not exactly like OP *nāma-* = “name” (not “his name”),<sup>19</sup> whereas *šumšu* (“his name”) is sometimes similarly used in Akkadian (cf. CAD *šumu* 1a.2-3: but the phenomenon does not seem commonplace, specially in late period documents<sup>20</sup>) –

<sup>16</sup> In all cases *k't* marks the arrival of the letter-writer's eventual order.

<sup>17</sup> In the letters in Ezra *k'n* (4.13,14, 6.6) and *k'nt* (4.11) are also more common than *k't* (5.17), though the small numbers probably makes this insignificant.

<sup>18</sup> ADAB A2:5 is worth note. The scribe first wrote *k'n 'mr 'Hmzd k't* (i.e. “now, Akhvamazda says, now”) and then erased the *k't* – understandably, since his initial text corresponds to no attested usage. Elsewhere in these letters (A1:9, A6:4) medial *k't* is precisely *not* conjoined with *'mr 'Hmzd* (whereas *k't 'Ršm kn 'mr* is common in the Bodleian corpus), so the eventual text at A2:5 represents a deliberately distinct trope.

<sup>19</sup> Comparable Greek usage is of just *onoma*: Thuc.4.133.3, 8.85.2, Xen.*Hell.*1.4.2, An.7.3.23, Cyr.2.2.11 (personal names), Thuc.6.4.1, Xen.*Hell.*2.1.15, An.1.2.24,4.4,11, 2.4.25,28, 6.2.3 (geographical names).

<sup>20</sup> Driver cites just PBS 2/1 205:12.

opening the possibility that it has a Semitic background. The fact that *šumšu* corresponds to OP *nāma-* in the Akkadian version of DB is of uncertain bearing (given that the Akkadian version was written first), as is the fact that a similar use of *hiše* (again, “his name”) is very common in Achaemenid Elamite. See also further 6.7:2-5 n.

Whatever its origin, *šmh* is not used in all Achaemenid era Aramaic texts: it is absent in the ostraca of CG and in ADAB. The latter at least is remarkable given the linguistic and stylistic similarities that *do* exist between the Bactrian letters and the Bodleian collection. Nor is *šmh* attached to all names in the texts in which is encountered. Sometimes one can characterize the persons to whose names *šmh* is attached.<sup>21</sup>

- Subordinates as described by (much) higher rank writers (whether or not a word such as *lym* is also present): A6.6, A6.9, A6.11, A6.12, A6.13, C2.1 IV:2, V:19, VII:31,36,39, VIII:52, XI:76,77. Ezra 5.14, where Tattenai refers to Sheshbazzar receiving temple-vessels from Cyrus, also belongs here, although he is not directly Tattenai’s subordinate.
- Slaves: A6.3, A6.7, B2.11:4,5,9,13, B3.3:3, B3.6:2,4, B3.7:3, B3.8:3, B3.9:3, B8.3:1, B8.6:4, Saqqara 55a:4, Lemaire & Chauveau 2008 fr.b,<sup>22</sup> WDSP 1.2, 3.1, 4.2, 5.2, 6.2, 7.1, 7.1’,2’, 9.1, 10.2, 19.2, 36 fr.2,4
- Household personnel (*nšy byt’*): D6.8, if the persons named here (two of whom seem to have Iranian names) do belong in that category. (If D6.8 is a companion piece to A6.11, the people in question belonged to the household of Pamun.)
- Leading Elephantine Jews (self-description): A4.10. (See further below.)
- A *degel* member: Saqqara 63:3, at least *prima facie*. The document contains some (probable) Iranian names, one also marked *šmh*, and perhaps also a version of the Iranian office title *hpthpt’*.
- Various officials in documentary sources
  - Wašu or Vasu the judge: Laghman II.9 (Davary/Humbach 1974; Delaunay 1976a) – a post-Achaemenid text, but worth note given the absence of *šmh* from ADAB, our more direct evidence for East Iranian Aramaic in the (late) Achaemenid era.
  - Sundry persons in PFAT.<sup>23</sup> (In the majority of the quite numerous PFAT occurrences, however, there is no specific way to judge status. Many are ration-receiving travellers -- which has some implications. A few have names that do not immediately look Iranian. But there is little reason to suspect servile or otherwise notably low status.)

But there are also plenty of cases where there are no very clear indications of status. The occurrences in D5.39 and D6.10 fr.c:1 are in completely fragmentary contexts. There is no way of telling why some but not all names in D8.2, C3.19:27,30ff and Saqqara 60 have the annotation.<sup>24</sup> In B8.5:8 “[PN lost] *šmh*” appears adjacent to a reference to imprisonment, which may or may not be significant; a similar situation arises in A4.6 (where two Egyptian

<sup>21</sup> It can also be attached to geographical places, but this usage is peculiar to the Aramaic version of DB (C2.1 IV:9,V:12,15,25, VII:30,41).

<sup>22</sup> If this rightly understood as about a slave-sale because of the presence of “gave” and “servant-girl (*’mh*).

<sup>23</sup> From information currently available to me I note (with varying degrees of confidence): 18 (*pirradaziš*, “fast messenger”), 53 (*rb ’sry*’, “chief of prisoners”), 181 and 232 (*rb swsh*, “chief of horses”), 233 (*’nbrn*, ?“head of wine-cellar”, taken as an abbreviation of \**āprnbara* [Azzoni]), 253 (*’rštmy*, lance-bearer: on the terminology cf. Henkelman 2002). In 180, 195 and 259 *’rsrn*, *hd[r’]* and *prstk* function as though they might be titles.

<sup>24</sup> One of the people *without* the annotation in B8.2 is a slave. Although Saqqara 60 is very damaged one can tell *šmh* was sometimes not applied from line 1 (“]mšk his son and Nabu son of[”) where, whether *šmh* was being put before or after patronymic, it ought to have appeared.

names are involved). D7.40 is restored as “[hou]se of Iddinnabu *šmh*”, which perhaps tells against slave status (but the restoration is uncertain). In Saqqara 17.1 QNPY *šmh* bears a name also known at Saqqara as that of a slave (‘*bd*: B8.2, Saqqara 50), albeit written with K, but that *is* a rather thin indication. (The rest of document has references to the house of the king, the garrison [*hyl*] and oath-swearing.) Some (but not all) of the persons described on Persepolis mortars has having “made this mortar” are labelled *šmh* (whereas none of the officials – *sgn*, treasurer -- are), but the status of these people is (precisely) uncertain.<sup>25</sup> In D6.1 “[*name damaged*] *šmh*” occurs in line 1, The rest of the document has some resonance of C3.9-C3.10 (cf. TADAE IV p.135) in that (a) it contains the phrase “great woman” (‘*nth rbh*), reminiscent of “great lady” in the other documents, (b) two lines consist of “PN his daughter under [...]”, where the end could be restored “under *mst*” as in the other documents. Porten-Yardeni’s label for C3.9-C3.10 is “fragmentary list of family units”. There is no reason to think them servile. “PN son of *Hmtn*, by name, the Caspian” appears in C3.8IIIA:6 (Memphis) alongside other names that lack *šmh*, but are assigned to a *degel*. Caspians are at home in Elephantine *degelin*. It is not very obvious why it is not only Ahiqar and Nadin (royal subordinates) but also King Esarhaddon who are so marked in C1.1 recto I:1,5,18, and then the trope is not used again – unless it be precisely to mark figures central to the narrative.

That would correspond to the way that in (non-list discourse in) the Bodleian letters *šmh* is regularly attached just to the first occurrence of a given name / individual,<sup>26</sup> and even then only to someone who is in some sense being introduced as a new and important element – someone who is the distinctive object of the letter. A similar principle is seen in contracts in B3 (B3.3,6,7-9): *šmh* marks the name(s) that are so-to-say the highlighted subject/object of the transaction (though, as it happens, they are also all of servile status). And it may also have been at work in some of texts now too fragmentary to assess properly. Decision whether or not to use the trope may be affected by the writer’s view of the subject’s relative status but it also interacts with the writer’s willingness to “objectify” the person as a topic of discussion or record. The writers of Aramaic tablets at Persepolis are not expressing their actual superiority to what must be higher status official functionaries but they are perhaps (not necessarily consciously) expressing their momentary bureaucratic control of the record about those functionaries. The Jewish community leaders in A4.10 are enclosing themselves in a rather formal and perhaps somewhat self-abasing form (implicitly marking their actual subordination to Arshama) in the hope that this will encourage him to take their bribe and finally authorize reconstruction of the temple. (See Appendix 2, pp.141,146.)

line 1 *br ḥḥpy...qbl*, “son of ‘A(n)khoḥap[i]...complained”. Driver read/restored end of line 1 as simply “...son of Aḥ-ḥapi [my *pqyd*]”. The longer reading “...son of ‘A(n)khoḥap[i] my servant has complained” results from Porten-Yardeni’s identification of fragment 7.1 as belonging at the end of lines 1 and 2.

line 1 *ḥḥpy*, “‘A(n)khoḥap[i]”. Egyptian ‘Ankhoḥapi (‘*nh-Ḥp*, “may Apis live”: DN 103). The name is written in Aramaic without a *nun* in all the references to Psamshek’s father (A6.3:1,2,7, A6.4:1,2,4,7, A6.6:2, A6.15:2) and in Saqqara 189, but with a *nun* in C3.14:21, C3.19:4,9,

<sup>25</sup> Bowman 1970: nos. 36,90,91,112,119,152. “Made this mortar” is the translation of Levine 1972, 77-78 (cf. Delaunay 1976b, 213); Bowman understood it as “used this mortar”. “Donated” is another suggestion (e.g. Segal 1972, 354). These texts remain somewhat puzzling. See Naveh & Shaked 1971, Levine 1972, Delaunay 1976.

<sup>26</sup> Similarly DB (OP) *nāma* is attached to the first occurrence of a name and does not reappear until the recapitulatory lists of enemies (§52) and helpers (§68). Stephanie Dalley draws my attention to a similar phenomenon in Akkadian slave sales.

D20.6. (The same variability occurs in Greek versions: Akhoapis, but also Agkhaphis, Agkhoupis, Agkhôphis: see Segal's note on Saqqara 189.)

line 1 *'lym' zyly*, “my servant”. This term is used by Arshama of Psamshek here (where he is not yet described as *pqyd*), ‘Ankhoḥapi (6.4:2, a reference to him in the past that does mention his erstwhile status as *pqyd*), Nakhtḥor (A6.6:2 + TADAE IV p.150), two Cilicians and an artisan accompanying Nakhtḥor to Egypt (A6.9:4), Peṭosiri (A6.11: also *wršbr*), a potential other recipient of the Pamun/Peṭosiri land (A6.11:5), and Ḥinzani (A6.12). Nakhtḥor is also said to have ten servants (A6.9: 3).<sup>27</sup> By contrast the miscreants in this letter and the Cilicians in A6.7 are “slaves” (*'bd*); and other persons are described as *garda* (A6.10) or “household personnel” (*nšy*) (A6.11, A6.12). The Cilicians of A6.15, on the other hand, are undesignated (save as “persons”: *gbrn*).<sup>28</sup> A6.12:1-2 suggests the possibility of some sort of assimilation of servants / household staff to *garda* (see further ad loc.).

Outside the Bodleian corpus *'lym* and *'bd* are used of the same individuals in B2.11, where Peṭosiri and Bela, described *passim* as *'bdn*, become *'lymn* once (l.13) in the phrase “Taba, the mother of these *'lymn*” – which is translated by Porten-Yardeni as “lads”, rather than e.g. “servants”, in accordance with the etymology of the word. (Compare Akkadian *qallu*, “the little one”, and the Greek use of *pais*; and note that Azzoni 2008, 261 proposes to translate [some] uses of *'lym* in PFAT as “child”, corresponding to Elamite *puhu*.) One may doubt how far this really undermines the normal distinction between the words.<sup>29</sup>

Deprecatory epistolary self-referencing always uses *'bd* (A1.1:1,6,8, A2.4:1, A3.1V:1, A3.7:1,5, A3.9:1,9, A3.11:1, A4.2:1,17, A4.3:2,12, A4.7:1,4,22, A4.8:1,3,21; A4.10:1, A5.3:1, A6.1:1,5, D1.9:1, D1.14:1, D1.16:1,3, D1.17:1, D7.21:1, CG 87 - all these in conjunction with *mr'/mr't* [sometimes restored] of the honoured recipient of the letter; also otherwise A2.4:1, A4.6:1 ) which perhaps on the whole confirms its lower status connotations. On *garda/kurtaš* see A6.10:1 n.

line 2 *bznh*, “in this (place)”. cf. “th[ere] (*t[mh]*) in 1.7 (for which cf. also 6.4:4). Arshama and Psamshek are remote from where Artavanta is, but Psamshek is going to be in his presence later. But nothing establishes the size of the distance between them. Compare below, note on line.9. Grelot 1972, 304 suggests that Psamshek actually carried the present letter from Arshama to Artavanta.

line 2 *'nh hwyt*, “I was coming”. For the son of a *pqyd* engaging in a journey on official business (which is presumably what Psamshek was doing) cf. A6.14. For journeys to and from Arshama in general cf. A6.5:3 n.

---

<sup>27</sup> “PN *'lym* of Sinerish the herald” (A6.1:7) is in line with this. So for that matter are the servants of Ṣeha and Ḥor in A4.3:4,8

<sup>28</sup> In the language of the Persepolis Fortification archive *mardam* (OP *\*varda-*, “worker”) is associated with workers belonging to the House of a noble Persian – i.e. noble estates can contain a special category of workers (Henkelman 2010, 710). There is no certain terminological analogue to this in the evidence about Arshama (but cf. 6.5:2 n.). For a fuller discussion of the incidence of (and terminology for) slaves or servile persons in the Egyptian Aramaic evidence, see Tuplin (forthcoming [g]).

<sup>29</sup> Jedaniah son of Teḥo (B3.9:3), described as *'lym* (translated “lad” in TADAE II) is regarded by Porten 1968, 80 etc. as a slave prior to the arrangements being made in B3.9. (Those arrangements, involving him not being liable to [re-]enslavement, perhaps account for the way he is labelled.) Other “lads” and “lasses” are detected in C3.27:30-31, D3.16:6, D7.9:6, D23.1 II:13-14, Va:5, IX:7. – Lindenberger's translation of *'lym zyly* as “my man” in A6.3:1, A6.4:2 etc. has slightly disconcerting overtones to the English ear.

line 2 *mr'*[y ..... *b]dn*, “my lord...slaves” Whitehead speculated that the gap might have contained a geographical name or the phrase *gbrn mšryn* (cf. A6.7:2). Grelot suggested *'dyn 'ty* giving “alors il y a”, citing A6.7:6 for *kzy*.... *'dyn* (quand ... alors ...).

line 2 *zy 'nh m...*, “whom I...”. This is another new reading resulting from fr.7.1 (cf. n. on line 1). The presence of “I” means that restoration of words meaning “who were coming” at the end of l.2 (Driver, Grelot, Whitehead) is ruled out. The sense was perhaps something like “whom I [was bringing]” (*m[hyth]*) (David Taylor).

line 3 *'hr 'l mr'y*, “...after to me to my lord”. Grelot rendered it “à ma suite”, Driver “in my train” (supported by a note saying “went after” = “accompanied” and citing Hebrew, Jewish Aramaic and Syriac usage). In Egyptian Aramaic *'hry* is used both to mean “after” (in time) – especially in the context of heirs (those who come after so-and-so) -- and with the sense “concerning, on the subject of”.

line 3 *mr'y*, “my lord”. This terminology (used both in direct address and, as here, in third-person references) recurs of Arshama in A4.5, A6.1, A6.4, A6.8, A6.13 and (presumably) in A4.10 and other fragmentary bits of the Bodleian letter-set (D6.3(a), D6.6(d,e,h), D6.8(f), D6.9(a)). It is also applied to other Persians (A4.7//A4.8 [Bagavahya], A5.3 [Mithravahisht], A6.10 (unnamed estate-owners); and cf. *mr'h* of Virafsha’ wife in A6.15) and non-Persians (A2.4, A3.1 (restored), A3.7, A3.9, A3.11, A4.2, A4.3, D1.9, D7.11, D7.21 = CG 70; and cf. *mr'h* in A3.7). The identity of the referent is unknown in A4.5, A5.2, B8.2, B8.5, D1.16, D1.22, D5.1, CG 87, CG 226, CG J3 and Saqqara 58.<sup>30</sup> In the Bactrian letters the referents are certainly Persian in A1, A2, A6 (Akhvamazda), B6 (Dahyubarzana), C2 (Vaidyura) and C4:56 (Sasan) and probably in B5. In a recurrent Elephantine legal formula precluding process “before *sgn'* or lord” (B3.10, B3.11, B4.6), “before *sgn'* or judge or lord” (B3.12) or “before judge or lord” (B3.2, B5.4)<sup>31</sup>, the word “lord” does not specify a particular administrative status (any more than *sgn'* probably does) but is indicative of a category of person: it is as though the world contains officials (*sgnyn*), judicial folk and *important people*, the sort who might claim to exercise jurisdiction not by virtue of specific office but by virtue of status – people whose relationship to the (relevant bit of the) world is like that of an owner in substance or by right of use, which is one of the meanings of *mr'* (A3.10:2, A4.4:8, D7.15:3).<sup>32</sup> “Lord” thus momentarily becomes a title-word of sorts – but only momentarily: the word in itself can create no presumption about e.g. the position (if any) occupied by Mithravahisht (A5.3) in the administration of Achaemenid Egypt. Its use in all contexts is simply a rhetorical product of the relationship between speaker and referent,<sup>33</sup> which is why the word’s use is largely confined to broadly epistolary contexts.

---

<sup>30</sup> Outside letters and documentary material *mr'* in Egyptian texts refers to kings (Taharka [D23.1.5A:9-10], Sennacherib [C3.8GVEx1 (TADAE III 166)], Pharaoh [A1.1]) as well as people of uncertain identity (C1.1:73,191,197-8; C1.2:23-24; C3.7GVEx1).

<sup>31</sup> We also get “before *sgn'* or judge” (B2.3, B3.1). In a different jurisdiction we find preclusion of suits before “king, satrap or judge”: PBS 2/1 21.

<sup>32</sup> One might compare a preclusion clause in BM 120024: “before the king or a *databara*, a judge or *anyone else who has power*” (my italics).

<sup>33</sup> Things are perhaps little different when *mr Prs* or *hrj Prs* (“Persian lord”) is used of Ariyawrata/\*Aryāvrata- (Posener 1936, nos.31,33-34) and *hrj* (lord) of Arshama and Artaya in S.H5–DP 434: 1,3,13, though they are perhaps complicated in the former case by the possibility that *mr Prs* and *hrj Prs* are meant to translate *srs Prs* (“*saris* of Persia”), the title used of Ariyawrata’s brother Atiyawahy (\*Āθivahyā or \*Āθiyavahyā) in Posener 1936, nos.24-30.

lines 3-4 *Psmškhsy...bkl*, “Psamshekḫasi... (in) all”. All the slaves seem to have Egyptian names; contrast the onomastically slightly mixed “Cilicians” of A6.7. There are various amendments to the TADAE I text in TADAE IV p.150:

- ‘Ankhoḫapi (3) is now son of *P[šnp]brḫp*. (Lindenberger forbears to print the new restoration, but reports it in a note.) TADAE I printed nothing, Driver thought the name was Psamshek.
- The man named after him at the end of line 3 (identified as son of Psamshek in 4) is *’Hr[tys]*. Lindenberger neither prints nor reports this restoration.
- In the second half of line 4 we now have PN son of *[š]ḥpmw*, Psamshek son of Wahpremaḫi, PN son of *Wh[pr’]*. Lindenberger does not print the first and third restorations but does incorporate them in his translation.

The (partly) decipherable names are thus as follows. (Underlined are the actual slaves, as distinct from slaves’ patronymics.) A couple are otherwise unknown in Egyptian Aramaic.

- Psmškhsy: Psamshekḫasi (p3-s(-n)mṯk+ḫsy, “Psammetichus is favoured”). Not in DN and not found elsewhere in Egyptian Aramaic.
- ..]twy: unidentified.
- ’ḥḫpy: ‘Ankhoḫapi (see above line 1 n.)
- Pšnpbrḫp: Pšenpeberekhef (p3-sry+n-p3-bw-ir-rh-f, “the son of the one who is unknown”: cf. DN 234). Not found elsewhere in Egyptian Aramaic texts.
- ’hrhys: Aḫertais (’I’ḥ+iir-dy+sw/sy, “It is (the) moon who gave him/her”: DN 57). Also in B8.4:19, C3.13:35, C3.19:16, Saqqara 41:9. The name is feminine in B8.4, masculine in C3.13 and C3.19, and indeterminate in Saqqara 41. The slave in the present document is presumable male.
- Psmšk: Psamshek (see above line 1 n.)
- Pšwbsty: Pshubaste (p3-šry+B3st.t, “son of Bastet”: DN 233). Not found otherwise in Egyptian Aramaic documents.
- Ḥwr: Ḥor (Ḥr) = “Horus” (DN 786-8). Also in A4.3:4,6,8; B1.1:16, B3.7:8, B3.10:10, B3.11:6, C1.2:2,3,7,8, C3.9:14,19, C3.9 frag.a:1,3, C3.10:3, C3.14:16, C3.18:6, C4.2:10, C4.6:3, C4.8:7, D8.11:7, D18.17, D20.3:1, D22.18:1. (It is, however, possible that the name merely began with the element Ḥwr.)
- Šḥpmw: Tjahapiemou (t3y+Ḥp+im.w, “may Apis seize them”: DN 1350f). Also found in D7.13:5, CG 258, CG X4 and, written as Šḥpymw, in A5.4:1, C3.19:10,13, Saqqara 54:8, 164:1.
- Psmšk: Psamshek (see above line 1 n.)
- Whpr’mḫy: Wahpremaḫi (w3ḫ-ib+R’+m-3h.t, Apries is in the horizon: DN 112f). Also found in A6.2:1,24,27. The final -t of the Egyptian name is lost in transcription, perhaps because of oral transmission (Porten 2002, 284)
- Whpr’: Wahpre’ (Apries) (w3ḫ-ib+R’, “Enduring of heart is Re”: DN 113). Also in A2.1:14, A2.2:14, A2.4:5-6, B2.1:19, B8.2:27, C4.1:3, C4.2 frag.a:3, frag.c:1, C4.3:13, C4.9:1, D3.3:7, D3.30:2-3, D7.35:3, D9.10:7, CG 186, CG X6

The presence of patronymics in the case of slaves would seem odd to a Greek (as Robert Parker has pointed out to us) and it would be unusual, if not unexampled, in a Babylonian one. The contrast with the Mišpeh Thirteen in A6.7 rather underlines the point. The need to distinguish between plentiful homonymous Egyptians may be one aspect of the explanation. There were presumably always a lot more Egyptians within the purview of Arshama’s Egyptian operations than of any other ethnic category.

line 5 *nksy lqhw wqrqw*, “took my goods and fled”. Cazelles 1954, 91 imagined that this occurred when Psamshek tried to take possession of the land-grant of A6.4, thus assuming (which is not necessary) that Psamshek was already *pqyd* and neglecting Psamshek’s own description of the circumstances as “when I was coming to my lord”.

line 5 *nksy* “my goods”. The nature of this was not immediately germane to the letter’s request and so remains uncertain. See A6.10:1 n.

lines 5-6 *k’n...yt’bd lhm*, “now...done to them”. Whitehead says that Driver, Grelot and Rundgren mistranslate line 6: “This entire clause is the order to be delivered. *šršwyt*, modified by a subordinate clause, is the subject of *yt’bd*.” (Porten-Yardeni seem to take the same view.) What is at issue here is partly what is restored at the end of line 5 (see below). The respective translations of 5-6 are:

- Whitehead: “Let word be sent to Artavanta [concerning the aforementioned servants whom] I shall present before him. Let the punishment which I order for them be meted out to them”.
- Driver: “Let (word) be sent unto Artawont [that if] I present [those men] before him, the punishment which I shall give orders (to inflict) be inflicted upon them”.
- Grelot: his version resembles Driver’s.
- Porten: “Let (word) be sent to Artavant [that those slaves whom] I shall present before him: the chastisement which I shall issue-an-order for them be done to them”

Whitehead’s overall treatment of the matter is somewhat obscured by an erroneous translation of the parallel material in lines 7-8; he prints the Aramaic text of those lines correctly, but truncates / re-arranges it in the translation. However it is clear in the Aramaic text that here too he treats the words starting with *šršwyt* as a separate sentence, and the text could be translated accordingly, provided one recognizes that there is nothing in the text of lines 6-7 expressing “concerning”.

line 5: *hn ‘l mr’y tv*, “if it (seems) good to my lord”: see note on A6.7:8 n.

line 5 *Rtwnt* [...]. The gap is variously restored:

- Driver: [*kzy hn gbry’ lk*] = “that if those men”
- Whitehead: [...*zy*]; but he translates “concerning the aforementioned servants whom”, which implies reading *‘l ‘bdy’ lk zy* (cf. more explicitly Whitehead 1974, 47)
- TADAE I: [*kzy ‘bdy’ lk zy*] = “that those slaves whom”
- TADAE IV p.150, Lindenberger: [*kzy ‘bdy’ lk zy*] = “that those slaves”. *Zy* disappears because the new fragment (11.20) is preserved to the edge of the page, and there is no *zy*. This slightly problematizes one’s understanding of the grammar: *prima facie* we do need a relative.

Driver (followed by Grelot) thus restores a conditional sentence – “if I present those men” – whereas Whitehead and Porten-Yardeni do not. This is probably not a matter of space (it cannot be certain there would not have been room for *hn*). Perhaps it is a desire to have as close a parallel as possible to line 7, which has no conditional element – a good argument up to a point: but the problem is precisely that line 7 does have the relative pronoun that we miss in line 5. Driver’s instinct (that a subordinating conjunction is required) was right, but we can also achieve that by accepting the revised Porten-Yardeni text and taking *kzy* as “when”. There is an associated substantive issue: have the slaves already been captured, or is the letter merely about what will happen if they are captured and Psamshek is in a position to bring them before Artavanta? Without *zy* at the end of line 5 and without a conditional or temporal conjunction, there is an especially stark suggestion that Psamshek is actually going to bring the slaves before

Artavanta. Driver's "if" prejudices the issue in favour of the slaves not yet having been captured. "When" leaves it open.

line 6 *srwšyt'*, "punishment". Iranian \**sraušyatā-*, "corporal punishment, chastisement" (Tavernier 2007, 448, after Benveniste 1954, 304 and Hinz 1975, 227). An alternative view that we have Iranian \**sraušyā-* (still meaning "punishment") with an Aramaic feminine ending (*t'*). *Sraušyā-* appears without *-t'* in one of the Bactrian letters (ADAB C3.41), where wine is allocated <*t*> *srwšy* ("<for> punishment") – which the editors take to mean for an official responsible for punishment. This perhaps favours the alternative view of *srwšyt'*. In Ezra 7.26 (Artaxerxes' rescript) we have *šršw* (Kethib) or *šršy* (Qere) as a punishment (*timōria* in 1 Esdr. 8.24); despite the initial *shin*, some think this the same word and translate "flogging" (cf. Fried 2001, 85, citing Rundgren 1957; and Naveh & Shaked 2012, 196). Williamson 1985, 97 thinks it cognate with Hebrew *šrš* = "uproot" and that it refers to banishment.

line 6 *'nh 'sym...t'm*, "I shall order". *'nh* is grammatically otiose, so Psamshek is perhaps pictured as laying special stress on his giving of the order: so Muraoka & Porten 2003, 158. The *'nh* in 1.2 ("when I was coming to my lord..."), on the other hand, they regard as an aspect of colloquial speech (ibid. 157 n.26). Substantively (as becomes clearer in lines 7-8) the situation is that Psamshek can be pictured as issuing an order (not *just* making a request that someone else issue an order) – and yet Artavanta has to issue an order too for the punishment actually to happen, and it is for Arshama, not Psamshek, to tell him to do so. Does this relate to the question of whether he is yet formally *pqyd'*? Or would Artavanta's intervention be required in any case?

line 6 *'sym...t'm*, "order". *šym t'm* occurs in Egyptian Aramaic in A4.5:21, A6.2:22-23,25, A6.3:6-8, A6.5:3, A6.7:8, C3.8IIIB:7,30,34, Saqqara 14,15, as well as several times in Biblical Aramaic. These tend to involve more-or-less "official" contexts, but it is hard to judge how far this makes the locution a *terminus technicus*. Perhaps the existence of the title *b'l t'm* and the subscript formula "PN know this *t'm*" (see Appendix 1) point a little in that direction. It is also notable that in A6.13:5 we effectively have *šym t'm*, but with *t'm* omitted: that may at least indicate the degree to which *šym t'm* was a *cliché*. The possibility has been raised that *šym t'm* is an Aramaic calque of an Iranian phrase, for the original of which we have no precise evidence (Jan Tavernier). Perhaps relevantly *t'm* itself is regarded by Kaufman 1974, 109 as a borrowing into Aramaic from Akkadian, because the sense "order" is long-established in Akkadian and novel in Official Aramaic.

lines 6, 8 *lhm*, "for them". Note the way *lhm* is put between the verb (*šym*) and *t'm*. That is even true in lines 7-8 where we also have the infinitive "to do", to which *lhm* might more properly seem to be attached. (That is, we have *yšm lhm t'm lm'bd*, not *yšm t'm lm'bd lhm* – compare *yt'bd lhm* in 1.6 and 1.8, "let it be done to them".) Nothing similar occurs in other instances of *šm t'm* in Porten & Lund 2002.

lines 6,8 *yt'bd*, "be done". Rundgren 1957: 404 (cf. Whitehead 1978, 134) thought *yt'bd* a "loan translation" from Persian (i.e. that it rendered *kar-* in a putative Persian phrase in which "do punishment" = "punish"). Ciancaglini 2008, 48-52 discusses use of the lexeme +*'bd* to make a denominative verb, a phenomenon that is sporadic in Official Aramaic, but fully developed in Syriac: she cites *gst ptgm yt'bd* (A6.8:3-4 [see below, note ad loc.], A6.10:9), *hndrz y'bdwn* (A6.13:4; and cf. ADAB A2:1, A4:1, A5:2, A6:6,9, not yet available to Ciancaglini) and (from Daniel) *hdmyn tt'bdwn* = "you will be directly punished". Syriac examples include *r'z' 'bd* (conspire, literally "make a secret" [\**raza*]) and *nhšyr' 'bd* ("hunt", from \**naxačarya*

= “hunting”). Brock alleged Coptic influence, but Ciancaglini regards the phenomenon as having happened too early for that to be the case. As relevant to OP she cites *xšaçam ... adam patipadam akunavam* (DB §14) and *adam gāthavā akunavam* (DSe §6). She does not seem to cite this case with \**šrausyāta-*. – The participle *yt’bd* does not agree with the feminine subject; Driver is relaxed about this as something common enough when other words intervene between subject and predicate, and Whitehead makes no comment. Muraoka & Porten 2003, 278-9 (§76 bb) deal with some disagreements in gender involving passive participles, but do not cite the present case, and do not articulate the idea that the phenomenon is normal. (If one decides that *srwšyt’* is, after all, a masculine noun, the problems are not over, because there is another gender-agreement problem involving the word in line 8: see n. ad loc.) Some failures of grammatical agreement in the Bactrian letters are noted at Naveh & Shaked 2012, 53.

line 7 *zky*, “that”. *Zky* is in principle a feminine form (Muraoka & Porten 2003, 57-58), as in A6.3:8, A6.8:2, B2.8: 9, B5.1:4,6; but here it refers to Psamshekḫasi, who is masculine. Other possible examples of “wrong” *-ky* demonstratives are A4.7:21 (*mn zky w’d ywm*, “from that [time?] until [this] day”<sup>34</sup>) and A6.4:3 (*dšn’ zky*, “that grant”); but the gender of *dšn’* is not firmly established, and the lack of specified noun in A4.7:21 leaves room for uncertainty. (Folmer 1995, 200 compares the use of feminine pronouns in Biblical Hebrew when the action or circumstances referred to is vaguely defined.) Muraoka & Porten 2003, 167 note that it was once claimed that the gender of the addressee determined use of *zky* (and *’lky*), but this is certainly no longer straightforwardly true in Persian period Aramaic (cf. also Folmer 1995, 202,207). Folmer 1995, 199-200 seeks to explain application of *zky* to Psamshekḫasi by taking *zky* to be appositive, not attributive, and then applying the Biblical Hebrew analogy (above). But this seems forced, and “its reference to a male remains problematic” (Muraoka & Porten 2003, 58 n.278).

line 7 *wknwth*, “and his companions”. An interesting extension to a non-official group -- or rather a reminder that the words we conventionally render as “and colleagues” had no specific official overtone in themselves, any more than e.g. *hoi met’autou* would in Greek. “Companions” (already in Lindenberger) is a more appropriate English term here. Similarly in A6.7:9 Lindenberger’s “co-workers” is perhaps justified, though “companions” is equally suitable. Whether his “associates” is better or worse than “colleagues” in A6.11:1,7, A6.12:1,4, A6.13:1,6, A6.14:1 -- in reference to the accountants addressed along with Nakhthor and Kenzasirma -- is moot. (We prefer “colleagues”.) Oddly he sticks with “colleagues” in A4.7:1//A4.8:1 (Jedaniah and his colleagues the priests): are priests more collegial than accountants? Still, one should not lose sight of the fact that in the administrative world individuals are not entirely individual. The locution “PN and his companions” (*akkayaše*) is endemic in the Persepolis Fortification archive. Would it be over-whimsical to see the rather striking reference to “King Darius and the princes” in A4.7:2-3//A4.8:2 as an extension of the trope of collegiality to the very pinnacle of the kingdom?

lines 8 *zky*, “that”. If this refers to *t’m* we have another example of the phenomenon mentioned above (note on line 7). Alternatively it refers to *srwšt’*, a word that has its own gender problems (cf. note on line 6).

line 9 *br byt’*, “prince”. See Introduction pp.21-25.

<sup>34</sup> But the parallel version in 4.8:20 has *zk*.

line 9 *bMšrym*, “in Egypt”. For provision in the external address line of a geographical reference point for the addressee that is absent from the internal address cf. A6.7:10 (Arshama to Artavanta<sup>35</sup>), A6.10:11 (Arshama to Nakht̥hor), A6.11:7, A6.12:4, A6.13:6 (Arshama to Nakht̥hor and others), A6.15:13 (Virafsha to Nakht̥hor).<sup>36</sup> The same phenomenon occurs in ADAB A1-6 (Akhvamazda to Bagavant). There is also a geographical annotation (“in Egypt”) in A6.2:27, but this time it refers to the *addressor* (Arshama), not the addressee. There are no such annotations in A6.8 (Arshama to Armapiya), A6.16 (Artahaya to Nakht̥hor) or ADAB B1-3 (between persons other than Akhvamazda and Bagavant). In ADAB A1-6 the annotation is naturally taken to imply that Bagavant and Akhvamazda are in quite distinct places (Khulmi and, presumably, Bactra). So do those in the Bodleian letters prove that Arshama (and Virafsha) were not where Artavanta and Nakht̥hor were, i.e. not in Egypt? This is the normal assumption (bolstered by other inferences from A6.9, A6.12 and Arshama’s known absence from Egypt in 410-407), and is sometimes elaborated with the idea that the “in Egypt” address presupposes a central postal depot for the whole country from which the letter would then be forwarded to the actual addressee (Alexander 1978). The fact that “in Egypt” can be attached to the addressor’s name (when the addressee is also in Egypt) may give one slight pause. Another thing that happens in external addresses but not internal ones is that titles are attached to the names of addressees (A6.1:7, A6.10:11, A6.11:7, A6.12:4, A6.13:6, A6.15:13, ADAB A2:8, A5:4) and addressors (A6.3:9, A6.4:5, A6.7:10).<sup>37</sup> Could it be that the geographical annotation (which is not a universal feature of Egyptian Aramaic letters: cf. n.37) is also quasi-titular and does not necessarily make an implicit statement about the extent of the physical distance between writer and addressee? The only letter from Arshama known *not* to use a geographical annotation in the external address is that to Armapiya. Is this the only one in the set written when Arshama was in Egypt?<sup>38</sup> Or is the fact that it is also the only one in which the addressor also lacks an official title a sign that for some reason the scribe simply neglected to “badge” properly Armapiya at all? See Introduction pp.26-30.

---

<sup>35</sup> The same thing can reasonably be restored in A6.4:5, A6.5:4).

<sup>36</sup> The gap in line 6 means there would theoretically be room for “in Egypt” to be restored in A6.14 after “from Varuvahya to Nakht̥hor and Hendasirma”. But what appears just before the gap does not look like either the *w* of *wknwth* (“and his colleagues”), which is what one expects here, or indeed the *b* of *bMšrym*.

<sup>37</sup> In the wider corpus of Egyptian Aramaic letters the external address line often adds filiation information about addressor and/or addressee. In the Hermopolis letters there is also an indication that the letter is to go to Syene or Luxor, but geographical markers are otherwise absent.

<sup>38</sup> Oddly, the “knows this order” official named in the subscript is Bagasrava, otherwise known in that role only in a letter (A6.9) that is *prima facie* written in Mesopotamia or Susa. But a secretariat official of this sort can be wherever Arshama happens to be at any given moment, so this does not help.

## A6.4 = Driver 2 = Grelot 62 = Lindenberger 37

### Transfer of grant to beneficiary's son

#### Summary

Arshama instructs Artavanta that the grant given by king and Arshama to Ankhoḥapi, Arshama's *pqyd* in domains in Upper and Lower Egypt is to be carried on by Ankhoḥapi's son Psamshek, who has become *pqyd* in Ankhoḥapi's place

#### Date

None given.

#### Text

Whitehead 1974, 38 remarks that some fragments have been mounted in the wrong place and that he has mostly ignored them. Driver 1965, 20 already notes that some stray fragments were mounted together with documents they were thought to go with but that little can be done with them. More specifically (1965, 41) he notes a couple of scraps attached to the outside face of the letter that belong to the inside, one in line 3 (part of *dšn*), one (reading .*b*') of unknown location. It is also apparently claimed (1965, 41, cf. 22n.) that there is another scrap on the outside (above the summary) with *dšn* which belongs in line 1. Nothing of this is reflected in TADAE I (where the only additions to Pell.Aram.XII are fragment 9.6 and the isolated fragment currently mounted at the bottom left of Pell.Aram.IV), and it is not very clear. It has no apparent connection with the use of fragments 4.16 to confirm two letters of a restoration in line 3. Lindenberger essentially follows Porten-Yardeni's text, but (a) does not print a full restoration of text for the gaps in the middle of lines 2 and 3, (b) differs in his placing of the square bracket marking the end of those gaps (and the one in line 1), and (c) brackets the second letter of *pqyd* at the start of line 3. None of this makes any substantive difference.

line 1: *'Rtwnt*, "Artavanta". See A6.3:1 n. Grelot 1972, 300 thought that Artavanta had previously refused Psamshek the *dšn*, prompting an appeal to Arshama. There is no particular reason to think this.

line 1: *šlm..lk*, "peace...to you". See A6.3:1 n.

line 1,3,4,6 *dšn*, "grant". Iranian \**dāšna-*, "gift, grant" (Tavernier 2007, 407). It survives as a word for "gift" in later Aramaic (cf. Jastrow [who also cites it as meaning "fat piece"], Sokoloff 2002, 355) and Syriac (Ciancaglini 2008, 159),<sup>39</sup> but Achaemenid era parallels are not numerous, and do not involve land-grants.

- Saqqara 41: "presents (*dšny*) for the birthday of *płnyh*". The word *bg'* (cf. below, note on line 2) appears two lines earlier, but given the specificity of "birthday", this is perhaps chance. On the other hand, *ywmyld'* = "birthday" is attested only here, so perhaps there is an outside chance that the letters require some other interpretation. The *dšn* entry is followed by reference to a quantity of flour (1 ardab).
- Ostrakon (second half of 4<sup>th</sup> c.), Nebi Yunis (Cross 1964): *B'łšd tq[lnx] // dšn*, "Ba'lišid, sheqels x, donation". A possible, but rejected, alternative reads first as *Ba'l Šur* = Lord of Tyre (an epithet of Baal), making the ostrakon the record of an anonymous donor's gift to Baal.

---

<sup>39</sup> Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995 cite nothing aside from the Bodleian Letters and Saqqara 41.

- The alleged (Tavernier 2007, 407) occurrence of Elamite *dāšna-* in PF 337 and PFNN 366 is an illusion: -*dašna* in these texts is part of the spelling of the name of Ahuramazda (cf. Henkelman 2008, 527-528, though without explicit comment on the matter)

Whitehead 1974, 40 speculated that *dšn* might be the *pqyd*'s income, i.e. difference between what he collects and what he has to pass to Arshama. Grelot 1972, 302 spoke of a "gratification", that is "la perception d'une certaine somme allouée par l'administration ('par le roi'), bref, une sorte de traitement [i.e. salary] qu'on ne saurait toucher sans prouver son droit". But Stolper (1985, 63,65) correctly highlights an analogy with Babylonian arrangements. Arshama's bailiff held property within his estate (the *dšn* of the present text), as did other subordinate individuals (Petosiri in A6.11), and such property was liable to tax or service-obligations (*hlk'*). In the same way Queen Parysatis' bailiff held a fief within her estate (TuM 2/3 185), as did certain other "servants" who were responsible to the bailiff (PBS 2/1 60); and *ilku* was due from bow lands in the estates of the Queen or the Crown Prince. The relationship substantively and/or as a matter of linguistic usage between bestowing a *dšn* and (as in A6.11, A6.13) a *bg* is debatable. Since the recipients in A6.11 (Petosiri) and A6.13 (the prince Varuvahya) are of greatly different status one from another (and indeed from Psamshek) one might say that *bg* is the generic word for a portion of land, while *dšn* focuses on the fact of its bestowal by a benefactor. The fact that the *dšn* (but not the *bg*' in A6.11,13) are said to be given by the king as well as Arshama is not inconsistent with this.

line 1, 3 *mn mlk' wmnny*, "(given) by the king and by me". Is this simply an acknowledgement of *ultimate* royal authority? Another royal grant (with different terminology) in an earlier Egyptian context appears in B1.1, where the defension clause in a joint venture contract from 515 BC refers to the possibility that Padi, son of Daganmelech, might give to his partner Aḥa, son of Ḥapio, a field "from my portion from the king (*hlq lmlk*), except for a word of the king" (i.e. unless the king forbids it).

line 2 *pqyd*, "official". Driver consistently uses "officer" for *pqyd*, Grelot "intendant", and Lindenberger "steward" (except in A6.9, where he uses "official"). The evidence about use of the term *pqyd* can be stated as follows.

1. The individuals in A6.3-A6.8 and A6.10-16 are concerned with the management of the private estates of Arshama (Ankhoḥapi, Psamshek, Nakhtḥor), Varuvahya (Ḥatubasti) Virafsha (\*Miḥapata<sup>40</sup>) and the unnamed "lords" of A6.10:4.<sup>41</sup> Onomastically speaking they are variously Egyptian (Ankhoḥapi, Psamshek, Nakhtḥor), Iranian (\*Miḥapata) and either Akkadian or Semitic-Egyptian (Ḥatubasti: see A6.13:3 n.). The possibility (it is no more than that) that Virafsha's *pqyd* \*Miḥapata (A6.15) recurs (without that title) in S.H5 DP-434 cannot pose any fundamental challenge to this view. (See A6.15:1 n. for the pros and cons of making the identification.) The fact that Artahaya addresses Nakhtḥor politely in A6.16 may establish that, while Nakhtḥor is inferior to the likes of Artavanta (the only person whom Arshama addresses politely), he is not of merely menial status. But that is not inconsistent with his being an estate-official, when the estate in question is that of a satrap and Son of the House. It is true that we cannot be absolutely sure how many *pqydyn* might have been active at any one time in Arshama's estates in Upper and Lower Egypt: the apparent uniqueness of (in succession) Ankhoḥapi, Psamshek and Nakhtḥor might be misleading (cf. Introduction p.15). But we do not have to postulate such a multiplicity of them as would markedly reduce their individual status in relation to the likes of Artahaya. In short, there is nothing so far to justify

<sup>40</sup> Also visible in D6.7 fr.c(inside):2, fr.c(outside):1.

<sup>41</sup> By contrast A6.9 says nothing about what Nakhtḥor's status as *pqyd* will entail when he reached Egypt.

Driver's belief (1965, 15) that *pqydn* were very senior officials, perhaps at the highest rank beneath the satrap in the administration of Egypt.<sup>42</sup> (On other occurrences of the word *pqyd* in Egypt, see below.)

2. In ADAB A6 we meet Vahya-ātar (\*Vayhātrva-: Tavernier 2007, 336), “*pqyd* at Dastakani and Vahumati, my servant (*lym*)” (i.e. Akhvamazda's). He has reported Bagavant's failure to put roofs on buildings at Vahumati and Artuki that belong to Akhvamazda and to bring grain and sesame (for) sowing as seed to Akhvamazda's granary building (*byt wsm*). Akhvamazda chides Bagavant for not acting “in accordance with my order (\**ništavana*)” (6), tells him to carry out the relevant tasks, and adds that, if he does not, he will not be let off (*l' tšbq*) and will pay the whole amount “from your own house to my house”. The context is plainly one involving Akhvamazda's estate, even if we do not follow Naveh & Shaked's suggestion (ad loc.) that Dastakani corresponds to JBA *dysqrt'ldsqrt'* and MP *dast(a)gird* and means “estate”. (That *nštwn'/\*ništavana* -- “instruction, decree” -- recurs in TADAE A6.1:3 in the context what seems to be state business is, of course, no counter-indication.) Perhaps this does not *prove* that Vahya-ātar is an estate-official (rather than just an observant and interfering provincial official), but it is the natural conclusion and his possible recurrence in ADAB C1:46 does not point in any other direction. (Of course this does, interestingly, imply that the local governor – who also, hardly surprisingly, has an estate – has been given responsibility for activities that might have been through within a *pqyd*'s remit. Perhaps there were resource implications that exceeded Vahya-ātar's reach. Although I doubt that Armapiya was a man of Bagavant's status, we have a situation here somewhat reminiscent of TADAE A6.8.)

3. More problematic are the *pqydn* of A6.9, seven individuals who are (a) located in eight named places on a one-to-one basis (except that Upastabara is given three locations, while Phradapharna and Haumadata(?) share Damascus) and (b) also associated with provinces inasmuch as rations are to come “from my estate which is in your province(s)” (*bmdyntkm*).

Their named locations are widely spaced (see the introduction to the commentary on A6.9); so, if Nakhtōr and his fellow-travellers literally got rations a day at a time (which is what line 6 incites one to think) they got them from a much larger number of individual locations within a series of provinces.<sup>43</sup> The document must have “worked” when read at unnamed places by people who are unidentified.<sup>44</sup> So *either* the named officials issued subsidiary authorisation documents when Nakhtōr and his companions arrived *or* the existing document was sufficient to work anywhere (so that, in effect, “to Bagapharna the *pqyd* who is in Salam” means “to whom it may concern in the province for/within which Bagapharna at Salam is the *pqyd*”). The disadvantage of the former solution is that it requires that the *pqydn*'s location is always at the edge of the province (for a traveller moving east-to-west),<sup>45</sup> so one may prefer the latter view.

A crucial characteristic of the *pqydn* is thus that their name and location(s) together define a whole region.<sup>46</sup> Since the region is labelled *mdynh* = “province” (whereas the

---

<sup>42</sup> Compare, but also contrast, Whitehead's suggestion (1974, 23-24) that the *pqyd* occupied in relation to the estate the same position as the *b'l t'm* (“vice-satrap”) in the official context of A6.2.

<sup>43</sup> Even if (against the norm in the Persepolis Fortification archive and the apparent implications of I.6) they sometimes took supplies for several days at once, there would still have to have been more than just seven supply-stations between central Mesopotamia and Egypt.

<sup>44</sup> That is certainly true if A6.9 was the only document that Nakhtōr was carrying; but it may actually be true even if it was not (for which possibility see the introduction to the commentary on A6.9).

<sup>45</sup> For further discussion of the geography of the document see the introduction to the commentary on A6.9.

<sup>46</sup> As already noted Upastabara has *three* bases, whereas two people (Phradapharna and Hw[.]t ?= Haumadata) share Damascus. If the *pqydn* are Arshama's estate-officials we could say that his Syrian estates were very large (so needed two *pqydn*) but geographically quite concentrated around

Egyptian *pqydyn* are linked with “Egypt”, “Upper and Lower Egypt” or “Lower Egypt”, none of which is technically speaking a “province”: see below, note on line 2), the simplest assumption is undoubtedly that they are provincial officials, whose writ runs systematically across a region in a way hard to imagine for estate-managers.

Are there any analogies for this? The only certainly relevant Aramaic texts are A4.2 and A5.5, both of which link the term with Thebes: more precisely, A5.5 refers to a “*pqyd* of Thebes”, while A4.2 speaks of “Mazdayasna the *pqyd* of/for the province” (*pqyd lmdyn*) immediately after an allusion to “the province (*mdynt*) of Thebes”. Both texts are fragmentary (particularly A5.5), but both have an official allure and even, in the cases of A5.5, a military one. The presence of the term “province” (*mdynh*) makes for a *prima facie* resemblance to the Mesopotamian/Levantine cases.<sup>47</sup>

Another potential source of illumination is Achaemenid Babylonia. In the Murašû archive the *paqdu* is always essentially in the estate management environment; there are so-called *paqdu*s of Nippur, but that is because Nippur was administratively construed as a *ḥaṭru* (estate-collective) and it is not a valid parallel to the *pqyd* of Thebes – especially since there is no call to regard Nippur as a *mdynh*.<sup>48</sup> Early Achaemenid documents produce more problems. There are several texts where the *paqdu* has been seen as a city-official, even a police-official.<sup>49</sup> Some could be construed as referring to temple officials,<sup>50</sup> but I am not sure all could; on the other hand some are linked to the names of relatively small communities (Šatmu, Šahrinu), so, if secular, they may be very local by the standards of Thebes (whether as city or province) or the places in A6.9. Since *paqdu* is simply the noun for the verb *paqdu* = “entrust, care for”, its field of application is, of course, no more etymologically limited or guaranteed than is that of Aramaic *pqyd* (from *p<sup>e</sup>qad* = deposit, command).<sup>51</sup>

---

Damascus (so they could both be based there) whereas in heartland Assyria the estates were rather scattered but individually too small to justify more than a single *pqyd*. Whether a comparable argument is equally easily available if the *pqydyn* are state (provincial) officials is doubtful, but obviously one cannot be sure. The same, incidentally, probably goes for drawing any inferences from the names of the *pqydyn*. Two are Babylonian, the rest Persian. Are Babylonian state-officials (regionally in charge of state-supplied foodstuffs) more or less improbable than Persian estate-managers? One is tempted to say more, but we really cannot know.

<sup>47</sup> Dupont-Sommer’s version of CG 44 = D7.10 (Dupont-Sommer 1963, 54) gives us a *pqyd* ordering that a prisoner be deprived of bread and water. But Porten-Yardeni interpret *pqyd* as verb-form (“it would be commanded”), as well as inserting a “not”. Putative occurrences of *pqyd* in Saqqara 64b and 85 are too uncertain and context-free to be of assistance. Bordreuil 1986 published a seal-stone inscribed *lpqyd yhd*, inviting one to believe in a *pqyd* of the province of Judah. But the current view is that the object is from the seventh c. and that the letters *pqydyhd* constitute a personal name (Avigad 1997, no.838). In the 8<sup>th</sup> c. Aramaic of Sefire III (KAI 224:4,10) *pqyd* designates a royal official. And in the Hebrew of *Esther* 2.3 we do have the king’s *pqydyn* collecting harem-girls from the provinces (*medinot*). Whether one categorizes that as state or estate business is a nice question.

<sup>48</sup> Stolper 1985, 22, 54, 65-68, 82; Stolper & Jursa 2007, 255. Another *paqdu* of Queen Parysatis can be identified in VAT 15618 (Stolper 2006a), though the word is not used. Nippur as *ḥaṭru*: cf. Stolper 1988, 17-18. Rare other late uses include Seleucid era references to royal officials in *AD* -273 r.34 and the caretaker of a temple in Sarkisian 1974, 24, 59 no.1:16,23, and an occurrence in van Dijk & Mayer 1980, no. 118 recto 3 (a Seleucid era text from Uruk, which also mentions the Uruk assembly).

<sup>49</sup> CT 22.73 (Sippar?), BIN 1.169 (Uruk), YOS 7.137 (Uruk and Šatmu), Cyr.328 (Šahrinu), GCCI 3.125 (Uruk?).

<sup>50</sup> BIN 1.169 (cf. CAD s.v. *paqdu*), YOS 7.137 (Dougherty 1923, 59; Holtz 2009, 180), perhaps YOS 6.71 (Uruk), OECT 9.42 (Uruk).

<sup>51</sup> Hence the “royal courtier who is installed in Eanna” (*ša rēš šarri ša ina ajakki paqdu*) and “the royal Aramaic-scribe who is installed in Eanna” (*sēpiru ša šarri ša ina ajakki paqdu*), in which titles *paqdu* is a verb-form meaning “installed” (cf. Kleber 2008, 30). HRETA 132 = Dougherty 1923, 20f

The answer to the question about analogies for the A6.9 *pqydyn* (conceived as provincial officials) is therefore that the *pqydyn* of A4.2 and A5.5 *might* count, but it is not clear that there is anything Babylonian that does. If, on the other hand, we chose to insist that *mdynh*, though generally translated “province”, *can* also mean “city” and then took the Babylonian evidence to authorize identification of the men in A4.2 and A5.5 as city-*pqydyn*, the men in A6.9 would become unique. Since that text is in any case unique (as an official Achaemenid document about travel-provisioning that does not come from the Persepolis archive) that might not be surprising – but it brings us back to questions of process and the question of whether the simple assumption (that the reason the *pqydyn* are treated as belonging to provinces is that they are provincial officials) is necessarily right. In other words, we cannot unambiguously establish what sort of people the *pqydyn* of A6.9 are simply by looking at attestations of the word *pqyd*. The answer depends on how we understand the mechanics of the system that will ensure that Nakhtḥor and his companions get fed: on this see the introduction to the commentary on A6.9.

line 2 *byn*, “among”. Since *byn* most distinctively means “between”,<sup>52</sup> some find its use here (where *b-*, “in” might seem perfectly appropriate) surprising; and, since *byn* was the MP heterogram for *andar* = “in”, a proposed explanation is that *byn bgy*’ is an Iranian turn of phrase, *byn* being a response to OP *antar*: thus Naveh & Shaked 2012, 51 (anticipated by Driver 1965, 39, Whitehead 1974, 250).<sup>53</sup> A similar phenomenon is postulated in ADAB A8:1, *byn šnyh* = “in his grain (field)”, and A10a:8, *byn ywmn 2* = “in two days”. In the latter case the use of similar expressions in A4.1:8, B3.4:20, B3.13:7, B4.5:7, B7.1:7 (legal documents from Elephantine, where there is no particular reason to expect an Aramaic calque of Iranian usage) might give one pause. Of course, in all those cases the reference is consciously to the passage of a period of time (“during those days”, “within so-and-so-many days”), so the *byn* = “between” is quite appropriate; but for all we can tell that was true in the fragmentary A10a:8 (as indeed in TADAE B8.7:8). ADAB A8:1 also occurs in a rather fragmentary text, so we cannot be sure that *byn* = “between” was not a suitable choice. And there is certainly a case for regarding *byn* in *byn bgy*’ as having the overtone “among” (see next note).

line 2 *bgy*’, “domains”. Iranian *\*bāga-* (Tavernier 2007, 446). (The underlying root, *bag-/baj-*, also gives *baga-* “god” and *bāji* “tribute, tax”.) *Bg* also appears in relation to Arshama in line 3 here and in A6.5:2, A6.6:3, A6.7:5, always in the phrase *byn bgy*’, which qualifies *pqyd* in A6.4:2,3 and “pressers” in A6.7:5, is of uncertain reference in A6.5:2, and appears in the phrase *’h ‘dy mn byn bgy’ zy mr’y* = “was removed from within the domains of my lord” in A6.6:3. There is no explicit description of a *pqyd* as *byn bgy*’ in any of the Nakhtḥor letters; but *bg* appears in A6.6:3 in what *is* probably a reference to Nakhtḥor (see note ad loc. for the new reading of that document), and it is conceivable that the *byn bgy*’ formula appeared in the lacuna in A6.6:2. The turn of phrase *mn byn bgy*’ (rather than just *mn bgy*’) in A6.6:3 perhaps underlines the “setness” of the phrase *byn bgy*’. In any event the choice of *byn*, properly “within, between, among”, may stress the multiplicity and discontinuity of the land-holdings

---

is evidently something else again: “28 workmen (*šābe*), the *puquda*, who in the mountains became free. These are the *puquda* whom their fathers gave to Innina of Erech and Nana for the *širkūtu*”.

<sup>52</sup> B2.1:13,14, B2.7:14, B2.10:7, B3.4:8,10, B3.5:10,11, B3.7:6,11, B3.11:5, B3.12:19,21, Saqqara 26.7,13 (physically between), C1.1:40,62,205 (physically between/among), B7.2:8,10 D20.5:4, C.1:161 (more metaphorically between/among), A3.10:2, B3.3:11-13 (of possessions “between X and Y”, i.e. jointly held by X and Y).

<sup>53</sup> *Antar* itself appears in Aramaic guise in ADAB A1:4, A2a:5 (*’ntr*), though this does not in itself preclude the co-existence of an Aramaic calque.

involved (already clear, of course, from “in Upper and Lower Egypt” in A6.4 and A6.7) rather than being an Aramaic calque (see above).

Aside from these more or less formulaic phrases, reference to Arshama’s property in the Bodleian letters describes it as his *byt*, both in Psamshek letters (A6.8) and elsewhere. The *bg*’ or *bg*y’ of others appear non-formulaically in A6.11:2-5 (formerly held by Pamun, and potentially now held by Peṭosiri) in the singular, and in A6.13:1,3,4 (held by Varuvahya) variously in the singular (when reference is to its being given to him by Arshama) and plural (when as source of *mndt*: 6.13:3 n.): the rationale for this variation is not very obvious (6.13:1 n.). Other instances in Egyptian texts (mostly from Saqqara) could all refer to land-allotments and appear in contexts where the granting of land to foreigners could (as in the Bodleian letters) be in question:

- *bg*’ D6.12e (Bodleian fragment), as a single word in a mere scrap of parchment.
- *bg* C3.6:8 (Saqqara: first half 5<sup>th</sup> c.), a fragmentary document whose second column has a list of names each against the heading “non-domain” (*l’ bg*): the names are variously Egyptian, Babylonian (a patronym), Aramaean or Hebrew.
- *bg*y’ D3.39b (Saqqara: fragmentary); the text also mentioned a Chorasmian (with a Babylonian name), Mushezibnabu of the *degel* of Marya, and a Sidonian.
- *bg*’ Saqqara 41: in an odd list of ?commodities, next to a putative personal name, WSK, which Segal leaves unexplained but Tavernier 2007, 340 interprets as \*Vasaka-, and two lines before putative birthday presents (*dšny*’: cf. above, note on line 1).
- *bg*’(?) Saqqara 46: another obscure document. In Segal’s translation 1.5 reads “and spread produce for the estates of”, and there is a reference to the *hy’l* three lines earlier.

But Segal actually prints *bg*y/*d* and the case is perhaps an uncertain one

Outside Egypt, *bg* was restored in Xanthos Trilingual line 10 by Teixidor (1978, 182), although others read *byt*: the reference is to property given to the god Kandawats. It may also occur in the Kemaliye inscription – that much at least is agreed between Lemaire & Kwasman 2002 and Stadel 2010. It occurs next to a reference to BYT: the line reads *mnd’ m ‘m mn byt’ bg*’, variously rendered as “whoever from the house / temple, the domain” (Lemaire & Kwasman) and “irgendetwas aus dem Haus / Tempel, dem Bereich” (Stadel). The next line mentions “the land(s), the vineyards and ???” (Lemaire & Kwasman) or “die Landereien, die Weinberge (unklar) (Stadel). The relevant words are *’rqt’ krmy’ wnd/rwn* (with many half-brackets it must be said). *’rqt*’ appears in A6.15: 6, of grain-fields. *Krmy*’ = vineyard is standard. Hoftijzer-Jongeling 1995 offer no help with the third word, but it is strangely reminiscent of Akkadian *nudunnû* (“woman’s property, dowry) represented in Babylonian Aramaic as *ndwny*’ (Sokoloff 2002, 730) and Biblical Hebrew as *ndny* (Ezek.16.33). The translators’ indecision between “house” and “temple” leaves open the possibility that this text, like Teixidor’s version of the Xanthus Trilingual, associates *bg* with a religious environment.

line 2 *b*’[*lyt’ wthtyt*’], “in U[pper and Lower (Egypt)]”. The phrase (which is safely restorable here from e.g. A6.7:6, where it is also used in relation to domains) simply means “in the upper and lower”<sup>54</sup> and, as a way of describing Egypt (which is clearly what it is doing, despite the absence of the word) represents a way of putting things that is not Egyptian: for Egyptians the two parts of the country were nominally associated with plant types, not physical positions. Upper and Lower are, of course, familiar to us as a way of describing southern and northern Egypt formulated in terms of the upper and lower (particularly the Delta) stretches of the Nile. But is that what the Aramaic writer meant? In the descriptions of real estate at

<sup>54</sup> Whitehead 1974, 41 claims *’lyt’ wthtyt*’ designates “Upper and Lower (Egypt)” when in emphatic form and is simply directional when in absolute form (though B3.7:11 does not fit).

Elephantine “upper” and “lower” meant north and south (Kraeling 1953, 79, Porten 1968, 308-310), as they also did to the writer of the mid-eighth century Sefire inscription (KAI 222A).<sup>55</sup> Could it be that when Arshama speaks of domains in Lower (Egypt) (A6.10:4, with n. ad loc.) he actually means the south, i.e. at least the Nile valley (and probably the Nile valley south of Memphis) as distinct from the Delta? Egyptians saw left and right back to front -- one viewed the Nile looking southwards, so the right bank was the west, not the east. Perhaps the Arshama texts are similarly (from our perspective) back to front. In any event, the terms are not administrative ones; they simply conjure up an ancient idea of the kingdom (or, now, satrapy) as the union of two lands. When a *pqyd* (here) or some Cilician workers (A6.7:6) are located “in my domains in Upper and Lower (Egypt)”, all that we can be sure about is that they are being placed somewhere in Egypt.<sup>56</sup> When Nakhtḥor is associated specifically with Lower Egypt (A6.10:11) that is because the situation there is germane to the letter; it certainly does not guarantee that he too could not be described (like ‘Ankḥoḥapi and Psamshek) as “*pqyd* in my domains in Upper and Lower Egypt” (after all, in A6.6 he is described simply as “in Egypt”) and it may not guarantee either that the estate for which he was responsible did not have components both in the Delta and the Nile valley or that he was the sole *pqyd* for the relevant domains.<sup>57</sup>

line 2 *Psmk brh zy ḥḥpy*, “Psamšek, the son of ‘A(n)khōḥapi”. We have *brh zy*, not just the normal patronymic formula, because here the relationship of Psamshek and ‘Ankḥoḥapi is substantively important.

line 2 *k’n*, “now”. For once (it is rare: Whitehead) *k’n* actually means “now”, rather than just serving as a structural marker (on which see A6.3:1 n.). A4.7:2.1 is another example: “favour ... a thousand times more than now”; and perhaps ADAB B1:2.

line 3 *pqyd...ḥlpwhy*, “official instead of him”. One imagines that father-son succession occurred not infrequently at various levels of the Achaemenid administrative system, though attestations tend to be at higher levels than this. The Pharnacid hold on the Dascylium satrapy is well-known (Lewis 1977, 52), but one can also point to comparable father-son successions involving Camisares and Datames (Nepos *Datames* 1), Rhesaces and Spithridates (Arr.1.12,15, Gusmani & Akkan 2004, Bosworth 1980, 111-112), Oudiastes and Mitradates (Ctesias 688 F16[58]), Idernes and Teritouchmes (id. F15[55]).<sup>58</sup> Otanes succeeded his father Sisamenes as royal judge

<sup>55</sup> It appears that the Elephantine usage applied an Aramaic linguistic association of upper and lower with north and south to an Egyptian tendency to list boundaries in a north-south-east-west order (Lyons 1907, 18-19).

<sup>56</sup> The thirteen Cilicians “appointed in domains in Upper and Lower (Egypt)” are clearly actually all in one locality; so “my domains in Upper and Lower Egypt” is a category title not a geographic expression.

<sup>57</sup> cf. also A6.8:1 n. The only more precise geographical marker in the Bodleian letters of which independent sense can be made (contrast Mišpeh(?) in A6.7) is the possible indication in A6.15:6 that Nakhtḥor was active in Papremis – if that is the correct reading and if Papremis is not simply a brand-mark for the wine involved (see note ad loc.). The exact location of Papremis is disputed (see n. ad loc.), but it is certainly in the NW Delta. That would put Nakhtḥor in Lower Egypt in the conventional sense of the term.

<sup>58</sup> The association of Bronchubelus with his father Mazaeus in Transeuphratene (Curt.5.13.11 with Briant 2002, 1013), Cranaspes with Oroetes in Lydia (Hdt.3.126-7) and Gubaru (Gaubar(u)va) and Napugu (\*Nafauga) in Babylonia (Zadok 1977, 91) illustrate the possible background to such successions. Of course there could be wider family-associations than just father and son: cf. Briant 1987, 26-27, citing Datames and Mithrobarzanes (Nep.*Dat.*5.9, Diod.15.91), Struthas and Tigranes (Xen.*Hell.*4.8.21), Artayntes and Ithamithres (Hdt.8.130), Pharnabazus + Bagaeus (Plut.*Alc.*39, Xen.*Hell.* 3.4.13), Memnon and his children (Diod.16.52), Mentor and Pharnabazus Arr.2.1.3)

(Hdt.5.25), and it is likely that three generations of the same family held the position of garrison commander in Syene-Elephantine.<sup>59</sup> The title “(royal) chamberlain” (*ustarbaru*) could also be hereditary (Eilers 1940: 88-9; Dandamaev 1992: 110, 123; Henkelman 2003, 162; Jursa 2011, 168).

line 3 *wḥtyt*, “Low[er Egypt]”. The restoration of “Lower Egypt” is confirmed in the new join reported in TADAE IV p.150.

line 3, 4 *lmsš*, “receive”. *Nš* is properly to “lift up” or “take away”, so “carry on” (Porten-Yardeni) may have an inappropriately strong overtone of continuity, and “take up” (Driver; Grelot had “percevoir”) would arguably be a less ambiguous rendering. If this is a distinction that can properly be drawn in Aramaic, the language is gently marking the break between the two holders, however transitory it may have been in practice: Arshama gives, and Arshama can take away – or fail to go on giving.<sup>60</sup> This is solely an issue of language; the *dašna* is a grant of usufruct with “inherent legal connotations of revocability with the option of renewal or reassignment to another” (Szubin & Porten 1987, 43).

line 3 *zky*, “that”. cf. 6.3:7 n.

line 4 *tmh bMšryn*, “there in Egypt”. There is no doubt that *tmh* distinctively means “there” (note the intentional contrast with *tnh* = “here” in e.g. A4.7:5-6, A6.7:1-2 and A6.13:1-2), and the conjunction of “there” and “in Egypt” certainly invites the conclusion that Arshama is writing from outside Egypt. The only alternative is to understand the phrase to mean “there [sc. where it (already) is]” or “there [where ‘Ankhoḥapi had it]” – i.e. as expressing a disjunction between the location of the writer (and the addressee) and the location of the *dšn*, not one between the location of the writer and the location of the addressee. For another argument of this sort cf. *štbq bgw* in A6.11:2, with note ad loc. On the wider issue see Introduction pp. 26-30.

line 5 *br byt*, “prince”. See Introduction pp.21-25.

line 6 *External summary* For external summaries (which are characteristically very badly preserved and hard to read, and in which Driver consistently saw, or claimed to have seen, more than is recognized by Porten-Yardeni) cf. A6.5, A6.7, A6.8, A6.10, A6.12, A6.15 (in Aramaic), A6.11 (in Demotic). In A6.13 a Demotic annotation (read as the PN Ḥotepḥep) is added immediately adjacent to the Aramaic summary, and the same name is said to appear on A6.12:4 (see n.) in the space in the address line between *mn* (“from”) and *Ršm* (“Arshama”).<sup>61</sup> There is also an element of summary amongst the annotations between the end of the letter and the address and scribe/date lines in A6.2 (Arshama’s letter about boat-repair). In this case, in contrast to the Bodleian (Aramaic) items, we are not dealing with text written in a corner or in smaller letters. But the Aramaic summary *is* in a different hand from the letter, and the Demotic summary (only “The boat...” survives) is necessarily written by someone else than the writer of the letter (perhaps the Sasobek whose name appears in Demotic immediately before).

The only items in the Bodleian set where the relevant part of the parchment survives (the left-hand extremity next to the address) but there is no sign of an Aramaic summary are A6.9 (an

<sup>59</sup> Vidranga (A3.9, A4.3, B2.9, B2.10, B3.9: known dates 420-416) is certainly the father of the Naphaina of A4.7:7 // A4.8:6 (refers to 410), and probably the son of the Naphaina of A5.2 (434/3 BC).

<sup>60</sup> Incidentally, for a striking parallel to Job 1.21 cf. CT 22.247: “The King has given, the king has taken, the king is lord”.

<sup>61</sup> To the untutored non-Demotist’s eye the letter traces in these two places do not look particularly similar.

open letter, which therefore has no verso text), A6.11 (where there *is* a Demotic one written in *above* the address line: see note ad loc.), 6.14 (Varuvahya to Nakhtḥor), 6.16 (Artaḥaya to Nakhtḥor), of which only A6.11 is a letter from Arshama. Summaries are not peculiar to Arshama's own letters, however, since we have one on A6.15 (Virafsha to Nakhtḥor). Nor do they always appear in official letters involving Arshama: A6.1, a letter from various functionaries *to* Arshama, has Address and Scribe/Date lines like A6.2 but no element of summary.

The situation with the highly fragmentary Bodleian material in TADAE IV is problematic. In D6.7 fr.(c)*verso* “[...]Masapata official of Virafsha[...]” in line 1 *might* be part of an address (but is it very likely that anyone was writing directly to Virafsha's agent?), but “[...sa]id to you, but the Cilicians...[...]” in line 2 certainly is not -- and does not sound much like a summary either. Moreover, it is written in full-size letters, unlike the external summaries in the relevant items in A6.3-16. D6.10 fr.(g)*verso*:1 (“[...]the Egyptians [...]), again in full-size letters, also does not seem to conform to expectations from TADAE I about external text either. It is hard to assess “partner-in-[chattel]” on D6.14 fr.(o)*verso*:2. On the other hand the Demotic name *Htp-b3st.t* or *Htp-is.t* in D6.11 fr.(h) could in principle correspond to the sort of Demotic annotation we find in A6.12 and A6.13.

At any point during initial transmission and/or subsequent storage when the letter was folded, the sort of summary we find in the Bodleian material in TADAE I allowed a quick insight into its content without the necessity of opening the document. A6.14 and A6.16 may be regarded as (relatively speaking) personal letters and the absence of summaries perhaps indicates that they were not intended to be filed formally for potential future reference.

Where present, the external text of the Bodleian letters consists at most of an address and summary. The Bactrian letters also have external text, but here four elements are potentially present: external address (A1-A6; B1, B1a, B2-B4), date (A1-A4; definitely absent in A5-A6, B1, B1a, B2-B4), brief summary (A1-5; definitely absent in A6, B1, B1a, B2-B4), and the words “bring this letter” (A1-A5, A8; definitely absent in B1, B1a, B2-B4).<sup>62</sup> ADAB A9 and A10 are more in the nature of *memoranda* than letters but, even so, A9 has a summary-like *verso* text (written across the narrow side) and A10 has a separate bottom line containing the word “disbursement” (which clearly characterizes the content of the main text) followed by a gap (as if for a seal?) and the name Fradaka. Of the four elements present in epistolary *verso* texts all but the address (which is necessarily universal) are peculiar to satrapal correspondence (the series A letters).<sup>63</sup> Two of these (date and “bring this letter”) are unknown in the Bodleian letters (though Arshama's letter about the Elephantine boat, A6.2, *does* have a date), and the Bactrian summaries are of a different character from those in the Bodleian letters, being shorter and incorporated a continuous piece of *verso* text that are clearly all written at the same time. So the *praxis* of Akhvamazda's office was not quite the same as (and to modern eyes at least looks somewhat tidier than) that of Arshama's – at least when the latter was dealing with estate matters. (I do not know whether the apparently aberrant TADAE IV Bodleian items noted above hint that some Arshama letters might have followed a different procedure.)

---

<sup>62</sup> The existence and/or content of a *verso* text is impossible to judge in A7, A8, B5-10.

<sup>63</sup> The same is true of the subscripts at the end of the letter-text (both in Bactria and Egypt). See Appendix 1.

## A6.5 = Driver 1 = Grelot 63

### Fragmentary letter

#### Summary

Arshama tells Artavanta to issue an order (*t'm*). Some people are to come to Arshama. There is reference to a *wršbr* called Kosakan.

#### Date

None given

#### Text

The history/state of the text is complicated. Whitehead says there are four fragments (A-D, reading right to left) mounted together. He reports that they are of different colour (light-dark-light-dark) and that the letters of B are smaller than A. (He does not comment on C, D.) In these terms Driver's text involved reading A-D horizontally as the remnants of a single text. (He also imported some words from Pell.Aram.IV at the start of line 1 and line 2, into gaps into A1 and A2.)

Whitehead just prints the four fragments separately, and notes that a rational conjoining of the bits of salutation formulae in A1 and B1 would produce a very long line. (Driver and Grelot use unattested truncated versions of the salutation formula to evade this.)

Porten thinks A, B and D are of similar colour and display similar handwriting. So he still does what Driver did with fragments A-B and D, but (a) C (recto and verso) becomes a separate document, described as Driver 1a [see below], (b) A and B are placed further apart than in the original mounting (which is shown in Porten 1979 93-95, plate): B more or less occupies the space next to D once taken by C. Removing C deals with Whitehead's problem about line length if the salutation formula is restored in accordance with A6.7.

Porten's version is clearly preferable inasmuch as it gets fragments A and B in the right relationship *vis à vis* the salutation formula; but it opens up a considerable gap in the middle of the document into which it would be entirely arbitrary to try to insert a conjectured text.

line 1: *'Rtwnt*, "Artavanta". See A6.3:1 n.

line 1 *šlm...lk*, "peace...to you". On formal greeting, crucial to the re-evaluation of the fragments, see A6.3:1 n.

line 1 *lk wk't*, "you...And now". Porten-Yardeni's textual restoration in TADAEI is partially confirmed by a new join (fr.12.8) in TADAE IV p.150, preserving *lk wk'[t]*.

line 2 *Kwskn*, "Kosakan". Tavernier 2007 does not recognize this as Iranian, or even discuss the possibility. Grelot and Driver believed the earlier reading, *Twskn*, to be Iranian, and there *are* names involving Tosa- in Tavernier (\*Tōsa-, \*Tōsaya-, \*Tōseča-). \*Kauša- and \*Kaušāna- are attested (as Elamite Kamša or Kamuša and Kamšana) at Persepolis (Tavernier 2007, 230), and one could in theory postulate that \*Kaušaka- (a *ka* extension of Kauša) and \*Kaušakāna- (patronymic ending) are possible names: *-w-* would be an appropriate rendering of *-au-*,<sup>64</sup> but the *-š-* is a problem. By contrast \*Kāsaka- (represented by Elamite Kaššaka: Tavernier 2007,

---

<sup>64</sup> cf. \*Asmaraupa- = 'Smrwp, \*Bagazauša- = Bgzwš, \*Gaubar(u)va- = Gwbrw, Gaumāta- = Gwmt (= Elamite Kammadda as well), \*Gauzaina- = Gwzyn, \*Hambauja- = Hmbws, \*Haumadāta- = Hwmdt, \*Haumayāsa- = Hwmys etc.

230) plus an *-āna* (patronymic) ending, which solves that problem, would leave *-o-* unexplained. – The part played by Kosakan in the matters to which the letter pertained is unstated: one could speculate that Arshama is writing in reaction to some information about his domains sent by Kosakan.

line 2 *wršbr*, “plenipotentiary”. The word recurs in A6.11, of a man petitioning for a grant of land. Various Iranian explanations have been suggested. (I am greatly indebted to Elizabeth Tucker for advice about all of these.)

- *\*varčabara-*: Tavernier 2007, 433-434, understanding it to mean “worker”, perhaps “supervisor of the work”. The implied literal meaning would be “work-carrier”, and getting from “carrier” to “supervisor” seems a little venturesome – but necessary if this line is followed at all, since the land-grant recipient in A6.11 can hardly be a mere worker. But the approach is more fundamentally problematic. *\*Varč-* does not represent an Iranian root meaning “work” (that would have to be *\*vard-*), but one meaning “energy, vital force” (*varāčah-*) – so getting to the meaning “worker” involves a debatable interpretation of what should *prima facie* be an abstract term. (Driver 1965, 67 already made a similar criticism of Henning’s suggestion that *\*varčabara-* denoted a *chargé d’affaires*, though that is perhaps a marginally easier interpretation of the putative underlying sense.)
- *\*varšabāra-*: mentioned in Driver 1954 (translating “mounted officer”) and approved by de Menasce 1954, 162, but dropped in Driver 1965. Grelot accepted the idea, but with the translation “monteur d’étalons” or “éleveur d’étalons” and hence “palfrenier”.
- *\*varšabara-*: Driver 1965, with the translation “forester” (Avestan *varāša*, “tree”). Gershevitch (ap. Hallock 1969, 39) took a similar view and offered “nurseryman” as another possible translation. (In his view *\*varšabara-* corresponded to Elamite *maršabara*; but see below.)
- *\*varčabara-*: Hoffmann (apud Altheim & Stiehl 1965, 566), with the translation “shield-bearer” (cf. *vərəθra* = shield [Bartholomae]). Tavernier 2007, 433 rejects this on the ground that there is another OP word for shield-bearer, *takabara-*. Since there can be more than one sort of shield, that is not a definitive argument. The suggestion is philologically sound.
- *\*xvaršabara-* = Elamite *maršabara-*: Hinz 1975, 140, accepted by Muraoka & Porten 2003, 344 (translating the word “plenipotentiary”, as already in Porten-Yardeni<sup>65</sup>) and Lindenberger (translating it as “food-warden” and taking this to designate the “administrator of a tenant farm” [2002, 105] or plain “tenant farmer” [2002, 92]). There are two problems: (i) *wršbr* would be a defective equivalent to *\*xvaršabara-*, because the *x* is ignored, whereas its representation by *ḥ* would be expected (Tavernier 2007, 433-434); and (ii) Elamite *maršabara* really corresponds to *\*(h)uvaršabara* or “quartermaster” -- so there is no independent evidence for the word *\*xvaršabara-* in the first place (ibid. 426). The non-philologist will feel some temptation to suggest that, if *wršbr* is a defective writing of anything, it might be of (precisely) *\*(h)uvaršabara*.

Setting philology aside for the moment one may observe:

- The likelihood that Peṭosiri’s claim to his father’s land in A6.11 is not formally grounded on his being a *wršbr* (A6.11:1 n.) tells us nothing either way about the sort of title *wršbr* might be.
- The (onomastic) ethnicity of the title’s holders (Egyptian in one case, unknown in the other -- but not to be assumed to be Iranian) is similarly not very helpful. It is not a status

<sup>65</sup> Was that influenced by Henning’s *chargé d’affaires*, even though that was prompted by a different putative Iranian original?

so elevated that it could only be held by an Iranian, but that does not impose a huge limitation.

- All of the senses suggested for *wršbr* seem more or less feasible in the context of Arshama's estate. If "forester" may seem to have the wrong connotations for Egypt, the fact that the underlying word can be taken as "tree" rather than "forest" (so Tavernier indicates) means one *could* e.g. think of someone responsible for fruit-trees in Egyptian gardens. (The alternative rendering "nurseryman" would be unproblematic.) "Shield-bearer" and "mounted officer" may seem contextually less likely than the other senses. But in view of the military overtones of A6.8 to take such a view may be to beg the question. (Moreover "shield-bearer" at least is the sort of term whose semantics as a title could have moved some way from the word's literal sense.)
- If *wršbr* connotes "worker", the link of a *wršbr* with the estate of someone like Arshama might call to mind the appearance of named individuals labelled as "workers" (Elamite *mardam* = OP *\*varda-*, a category distinct from the common-or-garden *kurtasš*) in the environment of high-status putative estate-holders in the Fortification archive (Henkelman 2010, 710). OP *\*varda-* is, of course, the expected correlate to Avestan *varəz-* "work" – the word to which Tavernier's *\*varčabara-* cannot properly correspond.

In sum: there is no entirely satisfactory explanation of the title shared by Kosakan and Peṭosiri. We have retained Porten-Yardeni's "plenipotentiary" in our translation, but with no great conviction.

line 2 *bgy*', "domains". See A6.4:2 n.

line 2 *zy kl*, "which all". The reference to Psamshek that Driver found towards the end of line 2 falls with Porten's reworking of the text (which expels the relevant partly preserved name and title to a separate fragment outside of this document: TADAE I p.106, "Driver 1a"), and this removes any basis (however slender) for speculating that Kosakan was Psamshek's predecessor as *pqyd*. The traces – all marked as uncertain -- that led Driver to have the interesting-sounding words "that they should be detained" at the end of his translation of line 2 (viz. *k[z]y [y]klw*) are now reduced to *zy kl*. Porten-Yardeni translated just "which...". But there is no particular reason not to regard *kl* as a complete word.

line 3 *'ly*, "to me". Driver's belief that the gap before this contained a reference here to Babylon was a mere conjecture based on the final words of the letter and an assumption about where Arshama was.<sup>66</sup>

line 3 *y'tw 'ly*, "let them come to me". Other examples of journeys to and from Arshama: A6.3, A6.9, A6.12, A6.13, A6.14. (In A6.15 it is clear that Virafsha's *pqyd*, now in Egypt, has been in Babylon, as indeed has Nakhtḥor.) In the perhaps remote case that *wršbr* refers to worker-management (see note on line 2), the traveller in this letter might be workers, and even a worker-group in some more interesting sense than that represented by the runaway slaves of 'Ankhoḥapi in A6.3 – one more reminiscent of the Mišpeh Thirteen, perhaps. But in truth we have no idea what is going on here.

---

<sup>66</sup> Driver also discerned "to Babylon" in the barely legible external summary. Porten-Yardeni forbear to make any suggestions about this piece of the text.

### **A6.5 bis = “Driver 1a” Fragmentary letter**

All that survives is “[P]samshek the *pqy[d]*”. It cannot be said that the restoration of “K[osakan]” as the addressor is strongly indicated by what remains of the first letter. In fact it depends heavily on an assumption that fragment C in some sense belonged with, even if it was not part of, A6.5.

## A6.6 = Driver fr.5.1,2,5 + TADAE IV p.150

### Fragmentary letter

#### Summary

Fragmentary piece in which Arshama reports to (?) Artavanta (restored) something involving the statement (apparently made by Nakhtḥor) that someone was “removed from the domains of my lord...”. Arshama’s instruction is entirely lost.

#### Date

None

#### Text

fr.5.2 is to be removed from this letter and replaced by fragments 3.3 and 3.11 (TADAE IV p.135). Actually fr.5.6 has also been added. But confusingly 5.6 appears twice in Foldout 9’s drawing, once as a new bit on the left hand edge and once at the right side (where it was already present in TADAE I: the very start of ll.3-4). I take it that this second “5.6” should actually be 5.5. The changes have produced one significant substantive change: see note on line 2.

line 1: *’Rtwnt*, “Artavanta”. See A6.3:1 n.

line 1 *šlm...šlm yšmw*”, “peace...appoint peace”. This greetings formula is not precisely paralleled. See A6.3:1 n., A6.16:2 n.

Line 2 *wk’t...Nḥthwr...zy bMšryn*, “and now.. Nakhtḥor....in Egypt”. The long gap was previously restored to contain a reference to Psamshek s. of Ankhoḥapi. The new information in TADAE IV p.150 shows that the reference was to Nakhtḥor – and even for Porten-Yardeni raised the possibility that that his patronymic might have been present (though it is still lost). How surprising would that be, considering that in all other Nakhtḥor letters there is no mention of the patronymic? Psamshek is identified with a patronymic on three occasions; but in two of them (A6.3, A6.4) the substance of the letters involves the father as well as the son and in the third (A6.15) the writer is Virafsha, so these may be special cases that cannot stand against a view that the *pqyd*’s patronym would not normally be used by Arshama.<sup>67</sup> (Moreover, Psamshek was an extremely common name, making further identification by patronymic quite tempting.) Hence one might even infer that A6.6 originally said something about Nakhtḥor that substantively involved Nakhtḥor’s father. But *br* PN remains a restoration, and strictly speaking nothing about the new fragment adds any weight to the original assumption that there was name and patronymic here – though it does not take it away either: it is after all rather more substantively confirmed that we have PN + *š[ml]* at this point, which was originally just a guess working back from the preserved end of line 2.<sup>68</sup> Grelot 1972, 315 n.1 already speculated about a connection between this fragment (actually just fr.5.1) and the situation dealt with in A6.10, essentially because the fragment refers to something or someone being removed from his domains. The revelation that A6.6 named Nakhtḥor as a source of information to Arshama perhaps sits a little ill with this, given that A6.10 criticizes Nakhtḥor for inactivity. But I suppose it is not impossible that we are here at some other stage in the story of the troubles alluded to in

<sup>67</sup> Not that Peḥosiri is ever called “son of Pamun” in A6.11 even though the father-son relation is substantively central.

<sup>68</sup> I note that in Porten & Lund 2002, 259a (s.v. *lym*) A6.6:2 is restored without a patronymic: Nakhtḥor is just “my servant”.

A6.10. Whatever the truth about that, there would probably be room here to restore the (*pqyd*) *byn bgy*’ (“in my domains”) formula in the missing section. (Far too little of the text survives for it to cast any light on Arshama’s whereabouts.)

line 3 *yt’bd mn*, “removed from”. TADAE IV p.150 (cf. p.135) indicates that the anonymous individual removed from Arshama’s domain was the son of *Ynhrw* = *Inharou* (Inaros) (*ir.t+n-Ḥr+r.w*, “the eye of Horus is against them”: DN 72f). The name may appear in A6.7:7 and in the Sheikh Fadl inscription (D23.1:5A:11,9:4,7: cf. Holm 2007, 201, after Vittmann and Ryholt) but is not otherwise certainly attested in Egyptian Aramaic. The suggestion that the man here might be a son of the mid-century rebel Inaros (hinted at in Holm 2007, 212) is perhaps over-venturesome. See also A6.7:7 n.

## A6.7 = Driver 5 = Grelot 66 = Lindenberger 40

### Release of Cilician slaves

#### Summary

When Egyptians rebelled (*mrdt*) the *hyl* "was garrisoned" (*hndyz*). Thirteen Cilician slaves did not get into the fortress. The wicked Inharou(?) seized them and they were with him. Arshama instructs Artahant to issue an order that no one do anything bad to the slaves. "Let them be released. Let them do my work as formerly."

#### Date

None given.

#### Text

Apart from the usual disagreements about square brackets (cf. A6.3, note on text), Lindenberger adds a numeral between *šmw* and *Sdsbnz* towards the end of line 3. The scribe certainly ought to have written such a numeral (every other entry is of the form "PN *šmw* l"), but, although there is damage to the parchment hereabouts, there is no doubt that (at least part of) any numeral that was present should have been clearly visible.

#### Position in set of letters

Unusually there is no reference to a *pqyd* either by title or name in this letter. Contrast A6.6,9-16 (Nakhtḥor), A6.3-4,5*bis*, 8 ('Ankhoḥapi / Psamshek). (A6.5 is too fragmentary to tell.) The positioning of the document in TADAE I presumes that it belongs with the Psamshek material on the basis that the rebellion of A6.7:6 is the one recalled in A6.10, which occurred when Psamshek was in office. Driver already took a similar view.

line 1 *'Rthnt*, "Artahanta". See A6.3:1 n.

lines 1-2 *šlm...šlm ytwy*, "peace...with you". Greeting formula: see A6.3:1 n. Note that the appearance of "and now" (*wk't*) between the two parts of the salutation is not simply a scribal aberration (*pace* Whitehead) since a salutation like this recurs in ADAB B3, B4, B6 – and can be restored in A6.5.<sup>69</sup> (David Taylor remarks that it is as though the writer meant to start the real letter at *wk't* and then could not resist some further *politesse*. One wonders what Artavanta had done to deserve this.) There is a slightly parallel feature in A3.3. The writer issues a salutation and then (apparently) starts the letter's main body: "And now (*wk't*) from the day that you went on that way, my heart was not glad. Likewise your mother." But that thought then prompts him to another salutation/prayer: "Now [*k't*], blessed be you by YHW the God, that he may show me your face in peace". And then we start the letter again: "Now (*k't*), from the day that you left [Lower] Egypt, salary has not been given..."

2-5 *Hylykn*, "Cilician men". Cazelles 1955, 93 held that, as the personal names include Egyptian and Persian ones (the former is not clear now) and as in A6.9 we find two "Cilicians" and an *ummānu* (artisan) travelling together, *ḥlkyn* should be a trade designation and is a false writing of *ḥlqyn* = "gardener". There is not much to be said for this view, and Grelot 1972, 307 affirms that the phrase *gbrn ḥlkyn* shows that the second word must be a name of a people. He also notes that the archaic orthography recalls Akkadian *Ḥilakku* and is found in Ezekiel 27.11. The

---

<sup>69</sup> Porten-Yardeni also restore it in the highly fragmentary D1.3.

repeated reference to Cilicians in these letters (also A6.9, A6.15) does not evoke any particularly rich independent evidence about Cilicians in Egypt or Cilician diaspora in general. (The topic does not appear to be addressed in e.g. Desideri & Jasink 1990, Vittmann 2003 or Casabonne 2004.) Relevant data might include:

- Cilicia appears in PFAT 195, an unpublished Aramaic travel text (perhaps as a destination?), but Cilicians seem otherwise absent from the Persepolis archive. It is hard to decide whether their general absence from the ranks of the foreign workers in Persepolis (where we do find Cappadocians, Carians and Lycians) reliably demonstrates that the processes of labour-dstraint applicable elsewhere normally did *not* apply in Cilicia (at least in the reigns of Darius and Xerxes). Were they retained for labour in the naval base (see below)?
- *Sktrsl*, son of *Srtn* in a pre-Achaemenid Aramaic text from Tayma has been claimed as potentially Cilician – but also Carian or Lycian (Müller & Al-Said 2001, 110). (By contrast Hayajneh [2001a, 43-44; 2001b, 87] claims the names are Babylonian.)
- For Cilicians in Babylonia in Neobabylonian and Achaemenid times cf. Joannès 1991, Zadok 2005. 2850 Cilician POWs are recorded in Nabonidus 8 ix 31f (Langdon 1912, 284-5; Schaudig 2001: 527f) and in general Babylonian military interaction with the region<sup>70</sup> is presumably a major historical background to the Cilician presence even later, for which note *inter alia* the Village of Cilicians near Sippar (Jursa 1998a, 26,42,92) and the people designated as Humaya in ration-lists (MacGinnis 2012, 46). Cilicia was also a source of iron: Joannès 1991, 263f. Even earlier Cilician slaves appear in Assyria in ADD 1099.
- Syrian and Cilician volunteers (mercenaries?) fight in Cyprus in Diod.16.42. No doubt there were various contexts in which Cilicians could end up outside Cilicia for military reasons: some went with Cyrus according to Diodorus (14.20). There is a particularly strong naval dimension. Wallinga 1991 postulated major naval base in Cilicia (cf. *inter alia* Hdt.5.108, 6.43,95, Diod.11.75,77, 14.39, 15.2), and Cilician ships figure in one source or another at Lade and Eurymedon, in Xerxes' Greek expedition, in Egypt and Cyprus in the mid-fifth century, in the fleet of 412/11 and under the command of Conon and Pharnabazus.
- We may have to allow for some so-called “Ionians”, e.g. some of those in the Customs Document (Cottier 2012 would leave that open as a possibility), being other than Greek. (Zadok 2005 already discussed some “Ionian” texts as an appendage to his treatment of explicit Cilicians.)
- Van Alfen 2004/5, 14 observes that the economic, cultural, and political ties between Cilicia and Egypt, the Levant, and Cyprus had long been quite close. That ought to be true; but it seems harder to demonstrate it than one might wish.

Some of Arshama's Cilicians are encountered in Babylonia (A6.15) – and (it seems) encountered as persons to be handed over for use in Egypt - and we need not assume that their role in Arshama's Egyptian estate is a wholly Eastern Mediterranean fact.

Identifying other comparable foreign workers in Achaemenid Egypt is not particularly easy. Dandamaev 1984, 574 drew attention to the fragmentary Memphis Shipyard Journal (C3.8), wherein we do find (besides Egyptians and Persians) people with Babylonian, Aramaean

---

<sup>70</sup> (a) Joint Babylonian-Cilician mediation between Lydia and Media in 585 (Hdt.1.74), (b) Nebuchadnezzar's undated operations in Ḫumê and Pirindu (Lambert 1965, 2), (c) Neriglissar's campaign against Appuašu of Pirindu (ABC 6, with Davesne, Lemaire & Lozmaheur 1987), (d) Nabonidus' Cilician operations in 556/5 and 555/4 (ABC 7, Beaulieu 1989, 20 no.1, Schaudig 2001, 3.3a IX.32).

and North-West Semitic names together with one man explicitly labelled Caspian.<sup>71</sup> But some belong to a *degel*, so are unlikely to be relevant unless one holds that *hyl* and *dgl* can refer to regimented workers (which even Aimé-Giron 1931, 57-62 does not quite assert: cf. A6.8:1 n.), and all may be of too high a status to match the case of Arshama's Cilicians. The same goes for Shamashshillech and his colleagues the \**framanakara*- in A6.2; and the Carian boatmen in the same document have Egyptian names and can readily be seen as members of non-Egyptian community of some historical standing. Hinzani the image-maker (A6.12) is an odd case, a man with some degree of skill *and* dependent household personnel, but one also classified (for rations purposes) with *grd*'. Slaves ('*bdn*) or supposed slaves (even if not described as '*bdn*) encountered in Elephantine are generally Egyptians belonging to Jews (B2.11, B3.6, B3.9, B3.12, D7.9). Otherwise, the only '*bdyn* who might be relevant<sup>72</sup> are all from Saqqara documents:

- A Cretan(?) called Thibrachos(?) (B8.3:1,6,7).<sup>73</sup> The document also mentions a Hyrcanian called Šhh = \*Saxva- (Tavernier 2007, 311) and the theft of someone's daughter Taxmapita (conceivably Iranian<sup>74</sup>), so we might claim to be in an Iranian bit of the Egyptian environment.
- "Your slaves 'zk and *mwd/r[ ]*" (Saqqara 59) -- perhaps \*Azaka- (neither affirmed nor denied in Tavernier 2007) and a name starting \*Mauda- (Tavernier 2007, 467)
- A slave called Wzn (Saqqara 68) = \*Vāzāna- (Tavernier 345)

As we know from A6.7, slaves with Iranian names need not be Iranians – but they will not perhaps in the first instance be thought to be Egyptians either.

lines 2-5 *Prym' šmh* | ...*Mwsrm šmh* |, "(he) whose name in Pariyama...(he) whose name is name Muwasarma" By contrast with the list of slaves in A6.3, all the names here have the *šmh* annotation (see A6.3:1 n.) but none has a patronymic, whereas in A6.3 only the first name has *šmh* but all have patronymics.

So far as the latter goes, perhaps Egyptians (in an Egyptian context) were more in need of the additional identification provided by a patronymic – especially when they stood to be punished – than were Cilicians.

As to *šmh*: In A4.6, which contains the remnants of a list, one cannot tell whether more than the first name had *šmh* (if indeed the first surviving name *was* the first name.) In A4.10 all the addressors have *šmh* and patronymic in what is rather a formal list, rounded off with

<sup>71</sup> Dandamaev actually spoke of Babylonians, Chorasmians and Phoenicians, but his citation of Aimé-Giron 1931, 57-62 rather elides the distinction between Journal and other bits of text.

<sup>72</sup> Other '*bdn* are often susceptible of no comment at all. Of those that are, people who are slaves of a god (Khnum: B3.7:8; Nabu: B8.4:7) are plainly not relevant here; and what *might* be agricultural workers in C3.18:11 are ethnically undefinable. The putative hiring (*škr*) of '*bdn* in Saqqara 101 is a bit too uncertain to justify dwelling too much on the presence elsewhere in the document of "province" and a Mithra- name; and the '*bdn* are ethnically undefined.

<sup>73</sup> Tavernier 2007, 426 takes *krtk* to be \**kāratāka*- = "traveller", not a Cretan (presumably making B8.3:1 mean "PN by name, slave of a traveller of mine"). Since the PN is imperfectly preserved ([*tb*]rḥš), and the gap at the start of the line is unquantifiable, elimination of "Cretan" makes Thibrachos an arbitrary restoration. [-]rḥš has a slightly Iranian allure. If e.g. Baug- (release) / Buga- (releasing) can give \*Rtabuxša (Tavernier 2007, 580-581) might Rauka- (light) give not only \*Rauxšana- (Aramaic *Rḥsn*) but also [-]ruxša (putative Aramaic -rḥš)? (But Elizabeth Tucker warns me that -*buxša*- is too unusual a formation to be safe basis for such speculation.)

<sup>74</sup> Tavernier 2007, 533-4 prefers an Egyptian interpretation, though, since (i) it is not certain the woman is the Cretan's daughter (and anyway Tavernier does not believe there is a Cretan involved: see previous note) and (ii) male Iranian names sometimes turn up in other cases applied to women, his arguments are not perhaps watertight.

“Syenians *mḥhsn* in Elephantine the fortress”, and this may also have been true in the letter (from the Bodleian set) of which D6.8 is the battered remnant.<sup>75</sup> (Note incidentally that in A4.6 and A4.10 *šmh* comes after the patronym, by contrast with A6.3.<sup>76</sup> The question does not arise in D6.8.) This may reinforce the (natural?) feeling that the list in A6.7 is more formally correct. Perhaps the scribe of A6.3 took the view that attaching it to the first name in A6.3 was (in conjunction with the preceding plural “slaves”) sufficient warning that a list of names was coming. On the *šmh* annotation more generally see A6.3:1 n.

lines 2-5 *Prym’ ....Mwsrm*. \*Bagafarnā- is certainly a Persian name (Tavernier 2007, 134), and \*Sāraka- probably is (ibid. 309).<sup>77</sup> Asmaraupa may well be too (ibid. 118), though Goetze (1962, 56-57) thought it Anatolian (formed from *asimi*- “beloved” plus an unidentified second element) and this view is followed in Porten & Lund 2002, 324. *K’* (Ka) was thought Egyptian by Driver 1965, 52 and Goetze 1962, 55, Hurrian by Driver 1965, 100 (cf. Goetze 1962, 52, 55 n.15) and Anatolian by Kornfeld 1978, 115 (followed by Porten & Lund 2002, 364). The fourth name in the list was read *T’npy* by Driver, which would yield Anatolian T’uanapiya (Goetze 1962, 56), but Porten-Yardeni plausibly think we actually have *T’ndy* or *T’nry*, which (however) Porten & Lund 2002, 420 still classify as Anatolian. (The potential link between *T’n* and the GN Tuḥana is unaffected, of course.) A more or less uncontroversially Anatolian explanation seems to be available for all the other properly preserved names (Goetze 1962, 55-57), and must surely be the best bet where that is the case (*Prym’* = *Pariyame’*, *’mwn* = *Ammun(a)* or *Ammuwana*, *Sdsbnz* = *Sadasbinazi*, *Srmnz* = *Sarmanazi*, *Pytr’nz* = *Piyatarḥunazi*, *Mwsrss* = *Muwasarma*). About [...]my and ’.[.]m it is hard to say: both could probably be Anatolian or Persian. The presence of Iranian names among Cilicians (and Cilician slaves at that) may be compared with a case in the Wadi Daliyeh texts (WDP 10.2: \*Bagabrta s. of Eli[ ]; cf. Tavernier 2007, 132).

line 5 *’bwškn*, “pressers (?)”. The word has been variously interpreted as \**abišavaka*- = “presser” (Tavernier 2007, 415, after Shaked), *abišvaka* = “mentioned before” (Eilers 1954-56, 332), “deserter” (*abišavaka*: Driver, followed by Grelot 1972, 309: *abi*- “to” + *šyav-/šav*- “go”), *abišyavaka* = “who is coming back home” (Hinz 1975, 18)

“Mentioned before” seems entirely superfluous. “Deserter” sits ill with “assigned/appointed in my domains”; “returners-home” is little better.

Whitehead 1974, 56, prompted by parallel structure of this document and A4.10, wondered if it was a GN: *’bwškn* is thus interpreted as a GN *’bwš* + *kn* (as in A4.10 we have *Swn* + *kn* to make “Syenian”) and means “men from *’bwš*”. The catch is that we ought to have a further *-n*, marking the Aramaic plural (cf. *Swknn* in A4.10). Whitehead dismisses that on ground that this is a foreign construction anyway, which seems a bit cavalier.<sup>78</sup> In any case, one cannot help feeling that, if they were all from this place they would have been called that in the first place, rather than “Cilicians”.

In the end it is much more likely that the word indicates something about these persons’ role in relation to Arshama’s domains and that it constitutes a function-designation, and in that regard “presser” is the only possibility on offer. Readers of the Persepolis archive will recall

<sup>75</sup> Assuming that frags. c and d at least indicate the presence of a list or lists. (D6.8 is what Porten-Yardeni identify as a companion letter to A6.11.) The situation in the other fragments of D6.8 and in with Saqqara 63 is less clear.

<sup>76</sup> In WDSP 1.2, 3.1, 7.1 *šmh* precedes the patronymic, as does *nama* in DB (OP). In C3.8III A:6 it follows, as in A4.6, A4.10.

<sup>77</sup> Goetze 1962, 56 and Driver 1975, 52 read *Srn* (Saran) and compared the putatively Anatolian *Sara-an* in an Assyrian document (Ungnad 1913, no.289)

<sup>78</sup> The case is not quite like the treatment of *hndyz* as an indeclinable foreign term (A6.7:6 n.) because here it is only the *-kn* suffix that is foreign (Iranian).

some sign therein of people who press sesame for oil – though also that, rather disconcertingly, the phrase literally translated as “he pressed oil” seems to be used metaphorically of conducting a strict investigation of something (cf. Hallock 1969, 39).<sup>79</sup>

Is there an implication that they existed as whatever they are *before* being assigned to Arshama’s estates? For, though he calls them from the outset “my slaves”, that is what they became from his point of view when assigned to his estates.

line 5 *mmnyn*, “appointed”. The word (*mnh*, *mny*) means “count” in A4.1:3 (counting days) and Daniel 5.26 (“God has counted your kingdom and finished it”, in the interpretation of *mene mene tekel upharsim*),<sup>80</sup> but “appoint” in Daniel 2.24,49, 3.12 (appointment of officials), A4.5 (“judges, police and hearers who are appointed in the province of Tshetres”), Saqqara 15.2 (“that are of my degel, 1, appointed” – reference unclear), Saqqara 26.7 (“now you appoint suitable men; between the gates let them guard strictly”), C1.1:37 (the king appoints men to carry out a task), ADAB A1.7 (men “appointed from the Gate of [the satrap]” to intervene in the camel-drivers dispute). As the word describing the thirteen Cilicians (*’bwškn*) is of uncertain meaning it might actually be safer to avoid the word “appoint” (which has somewhat limiting overtones in English) and go for e.g. “assign” – a translation that would work equally well in several of the other passages listed above.<sup>81</sup> (Whereas Porten & Yardeni render the current example simply as “had been appointed”, Muraoka & Porten 2003, 207 translate it slightly awkwardly as “held appointment as pressers”. Is this a response to the presence of auxiliary *hww* after it?) In the light A6.10 one might, of course, speculate that the process of attaching workers to the estate regularly included not only the marking of the body (“this one belongs to Arshama”?) but also the entry of a name in a register held in what Arshama there calls the *trbš*.

line 5 *bgy*, “domains”: see A6.4:2 n.

line 6 *b’lyt’ wthtyt’*, “in Upper and Lower (Egypt)”. See A6.4:2 n., A6.10:4 n., 11 n.

lines 6-8 *’hr... ’mh hww*, “after...were with him”. There is no indication of Arshama’s source of knowledge about the adventures of the Mišpeh Thirteen. The same is true in A6.10 of his discovery that Nakhtḥor is being neglectful, though he does explicitly refer to having heard about it (*tnh kn šmy’ ly*: see note on A6.10:3). Contrast the epistolary type represented e.g. by A6.3 (Arshama to Artavanta), A6.11 and A6.13 (Arshama to Nakhtḥor and others) in which Arshama quotes someone else’s report/request and then in varying degrees repeats the report/request in endorsing it.<sup>82</sup> (A6.6 may have been similar.<sup>83</sup>) In A6.4 (Arshama to

---

<sup>79</sup> The literal meaning is certain in PF 1248, and seems probable in PF 1989, PFNN 0159, PFNN 1495, PFNN 2540:17. But there are a dozen other PF texts where there is good reason to suspect that *mil hapira / mil hapišda* refer to people making (perhaps rather vigorous) enquiries – which is the use reflected in the Elamite versions of DB (8.18, 55.65, 63.82) and DNb (8c 12).

<sup>80</sup> Perhaps also in CG 41 and 244, but the cases are uncertain.

<sup>81</sup> Philochorus’ description of the Asiatic Greeks as “assigned to king’s house” (328 F149) could be translated into Aramaic (*pace* Lewis 1977, 146) in some fashion comparable to A6.10:7 (*bbyt zyly ’bdn*) (and cf. A6.11:4-5, A6.15:7), but perhaps using *mn’* instead of *’bd*.

<sup>82</sup> A6.11 involves a particularly full, though still not complete repetition. For this general model cf. ADAB A6. But the rhetoric of repetition is not dependent on the report + response format: it is also present in A6.10, despite its virtual suppression of a report element.

<sup>83</sup> The officials writing to Arshama in TADAE A6.1 start by quoting an order (*t’m*) sent to them and referring to a *\*ništavana-*, but what followed is entirely lost. The petitioner to (perhaps) Arshama in A5.2 gave a narrative account of the circumstances but (again) what followed is largely lost. Neither

Artavanta) and A6.8 (Arshama to Armapiya) the source of the information on which Arshama is acting is also made clear (in the latter case once again with quotation of the source, viz. Psamshek), but there is little or no mirror-repetition involved in the reply.<sup>84</sup> A6.15 (Virafsha to Nakht̄hor) is similar, though here we have three distinct report + response items in succession.<sup>85</sup> In A6.12 Arshama is not explicitly responding to a report or request,<sup>86</sup> and in A6.9 (the food-supply authorization) we have a multi-recipient letter of a quite different sort. (Instead of a binary report + response structure there is, if anything, an element of ring composition.) In A6.10 Arshama does quote something, but what he quotes is not someone's report to him, but his own earlier message to the recipient. In A6.14 Varuvahya alludes to (but does not quote) his separate message to Arshama (summarized in A6.13) as a basis for a related instruction to Nakht̄hor. Varuvahya never says who told him about his *pqyd*'s failings – if indeed anyone did: perhaps it is *just* the *non*-arrival of rent that prompts his letter (just as A6.16 is apparently prompted by the arrival of the wrong goods<sup>87</sup>) -- but, of course, we do not have his original letter to Arshama, only Arshama's summary of it.

Arshama's failure to indicate who told him about the Mišpeh slaves and about Nakht̄hor's neglect might, therefore, be described as unusual. Grelot 1972, 309 assumes that it was Artavanta himself, writing to ask guidance on what he should do, and this is doubtless the most economical hypothesis.

lines 6,7 *'hr*, "after". *'hr* either (as here) marks the next step in a narrative (A4.7:6,8 // A4.8:6,7, A6.15:3, B2.7:5, B2.9:8, B3.13:3, B8.2:25, B8.6:2,6,11, B8.10:2, B8.11:3, ADAB A1:3,4,7, A2:2, A4:2, B2:2, B4:4)<sup>88</sup> or, less frequently, appears *in apodosi* in conditional sentences (A6.9:6, A6.11:5, B2.11:10, B3.13:6,7,8,10, ADAB A4:3, B3:4, KAI 260B:4).<sup>89</sup> The absence of such uses in Old Aramaic and function of *'hr* as an ideogram for *pas* = "after" in MP have prompted the view (Driver 1965, 50, Whitehead 1978, 134 etc.) that the influence of OP *pasava* is at work here. (It is duly used to translate that word in the Aramaic version of DB.)

line 6 *Mšryn*, "Egypt". The present text speaks of "Egypt" rebelling (*Mšryn mrdt*), with the plural form *Mšryn* (perhaps reflecting the conjunction of Upper and Lower Egypt) treated as a singular feminine noun, whereas A6.10 has "the Egyptians" doing so (*Mšry' mrdw*). In English usage it would be easier to maintain of the latter than the former that it alluded to nothing more than some small local difficulty, but one hesitates to assume this would be true in Aramaic. It would certainly be unwise to assume that A6.7 and A6.10 have to be referring to different events. The difference in language may be simply a matter of scribal taste.

---

item, of course, naturally conforms to the report/request + response model anyway. On A6.2, which does, see the next footnote.

<sup>84</sup> The same is true in ADAB A1 (in which Akhvamazda quotes Vahuvakhshu's complaint about Bagavant at much greater length than ever occurs in the Bodleian letters – but cf. TADAE A6.2, which well exceeds ADAB A1 in length and complexity) and A2 and A4 (which, unlike any of the Bodleian letters, involves the writer quoting a message from the addressee).

<sup>85</sup> In both A6.8 and A6.15 the source of the report (Psamshek, Misapata) is not credited with making a request for specific action. to cite such a thing from a subordinate might have seemed demeaning to the writer.

<sup>86</sup> For this cf. ADAB A5.

<sup>87</sup> This letter is more like the series B letters in ADAB where there are no perceptible cases of report-quotation and not much even by way of scene setting, though B4 does have "And now (concerning) the letter that you sent to me instead of (sending) the donkey..."

<sup>88</sup> Its appearance in the protasis of a conditional sentence in A6.8:3 and B2.4:8 essentially corresponds to the narrative-continuation use.

<sup>89</sup> Other occurrences in Egyptian Aramaic (B8.1:3, Saqqara 16,18,26,51,60,98,163; CG 4, 260) are all too fragmentary or uncertain to be able to affect the picture reliably.

line 6 *mrđt*, “rebelled”. *Mrđ* is used persistently in DB (Aramaic) to mean “rebel” (the action of those individuals and peoples who opposed Darius’ kingship). The circumstances alluded to in the present letter – which were serious enough to involve the *hyl* being “garrisoned” (*hndz*: see below) and people taking refuge in a fortress and which it is not natural to think lay *very* far in the past at the time of writing -- have to be set in the context of a number of similar items in late fifth century Egyptian Aramaic texts.

- A4.5 (from Elephantine) refers to *degelin* of Egyptians “rebell[ing]” using the same word (*mrđw*) -- this is in reference to an occasion when by contrast the Jews did not leave their posts or do anything bad. They mention this as *Priamel* to reference to the events around the destruction of temple.<sup>90</sup> So it happened in/before 410 (as Lewis 1958 spelled out). Since the Jews are prepared to refer to what *did not* happen as long ago as 526 BC (A4.7/8, A4.9) in making their case about the temple-destruction, we should not simply *assume* that the Egyptian “rebellion” is recent (*pace* Grelot 1972, 298: “tout récent”): the (hard to answer) question is how far in the past a rebellion would have to be for the Jews’ loyal reaction to become less pertinent to the current situation than the non-destruction of the Jewish temple over a century earlier in 526. Porten 1968, 279 and Kraeling 1953, 103 put the rebellion in A4.5 in 424/3 (the Year of Four Kings from which Darius II emerged as victor) and that is surely possible so far as the rhetoric of the Jewish documents is concerned.
- A5.5 (from Elephantine) has the word *lmrđy’* (“to the rebels”) at the end of a fragmentary document that also alludes to soldiers (*hyl*), *degel*, chiefs of centuries, killing, and a fortress. No continuously sensible narrative survives, but the letter once reported a complex situation in some circumstantial detail and issued a consequential instruction, and it seems natural to assume that it deals with pretty recent events. But unfortunately we do not know the date of the letter, though Porten-Yardeni assign it to the late fifth century, presumably in part on palaeographical grounds.
- A6.10 contrasts “formerly when the Egyptians rebelled” (*mrđw*) (when Psamshek was *pqyd* and protected Arshama’s workers and property in Egypt) and the current “disturbances” (or “rioting”: Porten & Lund 2002, 290) during which Nakhtḥor is allegedly under-performing by comparison with the *pqydy*n in Lower Egypt. The word rendered as “disturbances” or “rioting” is *šwzy’*. This is a *hapax legomenon* of uncertain linguistic affiliation; its precise sense is therefore uncertain, as is the necessary degree of seriousness of the event to which it refers. (See A6.10:4 n.) The “rebellion” lies no further in the past than the start of Psamshek’s service as Arshama’s *pqyd* (which *could* be quite a long time), while the “troubles” are current.
- A6.11:2,4 uses *ywz’* of the “unrest in Egypt” during which Pamun perished. It is Nakhtḥor who has to deal with the consequences of Pamun’s demise and the abandonment of his domain (i.e. with Petosiri’s request to have possession of Pamun’s domain). It would be surprising if Petosiri had waited a very long time to try to recover his father’s property. *Ywz’* is Iranian \**yauza-*, “revolt, turmoil, rebellion”, and corresponds to OP *yauđa-*, a word used in royal inscriptions of serious imperial disorder (see A6.11:2 n.).

There is thus a linguistic distinction between four references to “rebellion” (*mrđ*) and two references to “troubles”; and there were at least two actual (linguistically distinguished) events, because A6.10 draws a contrast between a past “rebellion” and current “troubles”. The simplest solution (in the spirit of Ockham’s Razor) is to postulate one “rebellion” (mentioned four times -

---

<sup>90</sup> On this see Appendix 2.

- and in documents both from Elephantine and elsewhere<sup>91</sup>) and one other period of trouble (described variously as *šwzy* and *ywz'*: it would be even neater, of course, if we could believe that *šwzy* is an error for or a by-form of *ywz'*). None of the constraints on the dating of any of the events involved seems to preclude this solution.

A variant (retaining the distinction between *šwzy* and *ywz'*) would be to associate the *ywz'* with what is elsewhere called “rebellion”. Arguments in favour of this might be (i) the known association of OP *yauḏa-* with high-level disorder (as against uncertainty about the inherent implications of *šwzy*) and (ii) the fact that we are told of “*ywz'* in Egypt”, whereas the *šwzy* is arguably only associated with Lower Egypt (though this is debatable<sup>92</sup>). This view would tend to diminish the distance in time between the “rebellion” and the troubles of A6.10 more than A6.10 in itself would require, but would make no other difference to the overall situation: there would still be (in these texts) one “rebellion” and one set of “troubles”.

The simplest substantive alternative to the simplest solution would be to (a) link the *ywz'* and *šwzy*, not primarily because it might be possible to postulate a linguistic connection but rather because they appear in the same archive of documents and seem to give rise to similar results (harm to Arshama’s estate), but (b) re-open the possibility of there being two “rebellions”.

It is tempting to think that two references to “rebellion” in two Elephantine texts (A4.5 and A5.5) – albeit presumably from locally distinct sets of documents - are to the same event, though in one case (A4.5) we have a “historical” reference for rhetorical purposes, in the other (A5.5) part of the business of responding to a situation actually created by the “rebellion”. When that event might have been depends (so far as internal indications go) on constraints on Jewish rhetoric and the palaeography of A5.5. But reference to rebellion in A6.10, by contrast, is not even remotely archivally linked with what is found in A4.5 and A5.5; and the only internal chronological constraint is provided by Arshama’s half-century association with Egypt and the letters’ palaeography.<sup>93</sup> Students of Achaemenid Egypt have become very used to the idea that the Bodleian letters are from the late fifth century, but theoretically we might be dealing with two rebellions, both located no more precisely than within the time-frame 454-410, and, if so, there would be no guarantee against the Bodleian letters’ rebellion being different from that in the Elephantine letters. It could in principle be either earlier or later – though, if later, its

---

<sup>91</sup> Assuming, of course, that the Driver letters were not in fact found at Elephantine. – Kraeling 1953, 103 linked A4.5 to 424/3 and indicated that this could be the rebellion to which “the Borchardt leather documents look back”. Porten 1968, 279,287 assumes there can be a single rebellion context, whose date horizon might be either 424/3 or 410. Grelot 1972, 306 associates A6.7 with Amyrtaeus’ revolt in the Delta but also with the Persian scheming revealed in A4.5,7-9 (i.e. the temple affray in 410), while locating the rebellion in A6.10 and A4.5 in 411/410. (About the “troubles” of A6.10-11 he said nothing; and A5.5 is not in his collection. A 411/10 date for the rebellion in A4.5 is asserted on p.313 *à propos* of A6.10; nothing is said in the comments on A4.5.) Amyrtaeus appears because of Grelot’s belief that the nationalist “agitation” that was part of the background to the temple affray and was evident also in the Egyptian troops’ rebellion of A4.5 (cf. 1972, 298) was caused by the later pharaoh and started in 416 (44) or 414 (399). His argument for this is that, since Amyrtaeus II was the grandson of Amyrtaeus I and since Amyrtaeus I died c. 449, his “ambitions” must have started to show in 415-410 – though I wonder if he was also influenced by old views about Amyrtaeus based on a Eusebian chronology that associates him with 413/2-408/7 or 411/10-406/05. I think Grelot assumes a single rebellion (in 411/0), but his treatment (split between different parts of his book) is less than wholly lucid.

<sup>92</sup> The question is whether Nakhtḥor is implicitly being associated with Upper Egypt – in which case disorder was not confined to one part of the satrapy. Incidentally, the fact that none of the letters shows any inclination to locate trouble more precisely than in one half of Egypt does tell against any inclination to try to limit the scope of the disorders. Arshama surely every reason to say “the trouble in such-and-such a place” is that is all there was.

<sup>93</sup> Naveh 1970 seems to leave quite a large target area here.

circumstances and (particularly) its impact in the south of Egypt country cannot have been such as to damage the rhetorical effect of the Jews' reference to the putatively earlier event.

The reason that we are all used to the idea of the Bodleian letters being late fifth century is that Lewis 1958 went for the simplest solution and then anchored it to a particular date horizon by deploying data entirely external to the Aramaic texts: more precisely, the “rebellion” was a revolt in 411 alluded to by Diodorus 13.46.6 (Arabian and Egyptian kings plotting against *ta peri tēn Phoinikēn pragmata*). The proximity of 411 to the *terminus ante quem* of 410 provided by A4.5 may or may not count as a reason in favour of this solution. One possible reason for not following Lewis or for postulating that there are references to more than one rebellion is the worry that, on other evidence (from silence), the succession troubles of 424/3 generated no disturbance in Egypt. This seems surprising, but it is a tricky judgment to decide whether it is so surprising as to dictate a particular solution to our present problem. (See Introduction pp.30-33.)

A6.7:6 *hyl'*, “the (armed) force”. Given the conjunction with *hndz* and the direct parallel with A4.5:7, there is no reasonable doubt that this *hyl'* is military. See also A6.8:1 n.

line 6 *hndyz*, “garrisoned”. Iranian *\*handaiza-* (Tavernier 2007, 451, after Hinz and others), cognate with OP *dida-* = “fort” and evidently conveying the idea of being gathered together in a fort. It is variously translated as “posted” (Porten 1968, 244), “garrisoned” (Porten-Yardeni), “consigné(es)” (Grelot: glossed as “concentration des troupes”), “held in barracks” (Driver), “mobilized” (Lindenberger). Although it functions as an adjective, *hndyz* does not have a plural adjective ending -- i.e. the word is treated as an indeclinable foreign technical term. Compare A6.10:3 n. (on *wspzn*).

Philologically speaking *hndyz/\*handaiza* is distinct from *\*handaisa* (represented by Akkadian *andēsu* in UET 4.109 [397 or 351 BC] and reflected in Armenian *handes*), a word meaning “muster, mobilisation” (lit. “showing together”). The latter term is used of a royal muster (*andēsu ša šarri*) to which a bow-fief holder is arranging for someone else to go as his substitute. The occasion of the event is not particularly clear, but there is no reason to think that the gathering is a response to pressing military crisis of any sort. In A6.7, on the other hand, *hndyz/\*handaiza* does seem to mark a moment of real danger: there is a rebellion, the Mišpeh Thirteen cannot get “into the fortress”, and the natural assumption is that “the fortress” is precisely where the *hyl* is *hndyz*. But other occurrences are rather more equivocal.

1. A4.5 (410 or slightly later) refers to a well from which (members of) the *hyl* drank when *hndyz*. The Khnum priests blocked it, as well as demolishing part of the royal barley-house and building a wall in middle of the fortress. It is next to impossible to tell whether being *hndyz* is envisaged as regular or exceptional. Porten-Yardeni's “*whenever* [my italics] they would be garrisoned (there) they would drink...” arguably imports an unwarranted suggestion of regularity, since the Aramaic simply has “if” (so Grelot's more neutral “si l'on était consigné, on buvait...” is on the face of it more accurate).<sup>94</sup>

2. B2.7 (17.11.446) refers to goods (worth 5 karsh of silver and eventually repaid with the gift of a house) borrowed by Maseiah from his daughter Mibtaiah. As translated by Porten-Yardeni the father consumed the loan and did not find silver or gold to repay it “when I was *hndyz*”. As translated by Grelot the loan occurred “lorsque je fus consigné”, and Cowley had taken the same view about the reference of the temporal clause (though he translated it

---

<sup>94</sup> The relevant bit most literally translates as “so that if they will be *hndyz*, they drink (are drinking) water from that well”. Perusal of Muraoka-Porten 2003, 323-326 leaves me uncertain how significant the imperfective in the protasis actually is, i.e. whether we cannot translate the phrase in context as “so that if they were *hndyz*, they drank” (dispensing with Porten-Yardeni's awkward “would be garrisoned”).

differently). Grelot's translation entails that a soldier who was *hndyz* was not *incommunicado* (unless the temporal clause is loose and really means "when the army was about to be *hndyz*"), Porten's might leave it open that he was.<sup>95</sup>

There was no separate fortress inside Elephantine. Instead the island city was surrounded by a wall dating from the 21st dynasty (von Pilgrim 2010: 267 and fig.3); this is why domestic real estate changing hands can be described as "in Yeb the fortress". So being *hndyz* meant being confined to the city and perhaps (cf. A4.5 on the well) unable even to get to the Nile bank to draw water. Since Maseiah's daughter also lived in Elephantine there would *prima facie* be no impediment to their property transaction, and we do not have to think about him being *incommunicado*. It would be another matter if the *hyl* (or part of it) was being taken to some *other* fortress. B2.7 does not specify it was in Elephantine, and the fact that A4.5 proves *hndyz* can refer to Elephantine does not prove that it always does.

Porten's translation may also suggest a quite prolonged period of *hndyz* – assuming that all the consumption occurred within it and was just for Maseiah's benefit. (If he was spending it on a large group of people the time could be shorter. We cannot tell whether that might be the case.) The sum involved was, according to Porten 1968, 75, nearly three times the cost of a 400 m<sup>2</sup> house, though also less than the cost of two high-class woollen garments.<sup>96</sup> Since the *nksy* Maseiah is said to have borrowed are most likely to be perishables (Porten 2011, 186 n.15), more specifically food ('*kl* does mean literally "eat" in all Egyptian Aramaic texts where one can tell), more relevant is Porten's suggestion that 50 shekels would be rather over four months' income for a family of three.<sup>97</sup> Perhaps there is a useful order of magnitude in such a calculation and perhaps it suggests a length of confinement-to-fort long enough to suggest a degree of crisis. But there is much uncertainty here.

line 7 *l' šnšyw*, "were not able". Driver claimed that *šnšy* = "to succeed" is an Akkadian loanword (more specifically: the underlying Aramaic verb is the nasalized form of an equivalent of Akkadian *mašu* = "to be wide, suffice" or more precisely of the causative equivalent *šunšû* = "pay fully" or "achieve, perform satisfactory rites"). Kaufman 1974, 104 took a similar view ("a Babylonianized pronunciation...of a native Ar. form \**šmšy*). Whitehead calls it Shaf'el perfect 3MP of *mšy* ("to be able") but also thinks Akkadian origin is possible. But no such possibility is registered by Muraoka & Porten 2003.

line 7 *bbyrt'*, "into the fortress". The spectacle of Arshama's workers expected (though failing) to find refuge in a fortress calls to mind Xenophon *Anabasis* 7.8.12-15 (where some *andrapoda* fail to secure protection from Xenophon's bandit party in the *tursis* of Asidates), the estate plus fortress landscape in the *Cyropaedia* associated with Gadatas and Gobryas (Gobryas rules land surrounding a fortress, pays *dasmos* and provides cavalry; Gadatas controls various

---

<sup>95</sup> That Maseiah specifies the circumstances of the loan *perhaps* suggests they were germane to its being made -- i.e. he is not just mentioning it as a chronological marker. (Such specification is not normal. No explanation is given in B3.1, B4.2, B4.3//B4.4, B4.5, B4.6. B3.13 specifies that Anani came to the Syene house of Pakhnum to borrow emmer, but says nothing about why the loan was needed, nor do we learn the circumstances. There is also no explanation of the circumstances in which goods were taken on deposit in C2.9 (*bpqdn*). The *gifts* in B3.5, B3.10 and B5.5 are only cursorily explained.) On that view he needed the loan because he and the *hyl* were (about to be) *hndyz* – and that may be true whichever translation of the passage one adopts.

<sup>96</sup> The value of things at Elephantine does not entirely accord with modern expectations.

<sup>97</sup> This was based on Michel's 272 dr. (= 136 shekel, on the assumption that the 2 shekel "stater" is a tetradrachm) figure for annual cost of living in Athens (Michel 1957, 132f), adjusted slightly to 144 shekels for ease of 12 monthly calculations. The Greek 1 dr. per day wage for soldiers is 15 shekels per month, so Mahseiah would be borrowing over three months' wages.

*khoria*, at least one of which has villages around it, and can provide military forces),<sup>98</sup> a set of Persepolis texts involving a man called Ukama, fortresses and estates,<sup>99</sup> and the fact that in the Elamite version of DB §47 Arshada (in Arachosia) is both the estate (*irmatam*) of Vivana and a fortress.<sup>100</sup> For a wider perspective on this see Tuplin (forthcoming [a]). Those inclined to identify the Inaros named just below with the rebel of the 450s have mooted an identification of the fortress with the White Fort at Memphis, where those supporting Persian rule took refuge after the Battle of Papremis (Thucydides 1.104, Diodorus 11.74). But the former view does not require the latter (as Dandamaev 1989, 243 acknowledges). There does not seem to be any prospect of re-reading *Msph* in line 14 as *Mnpy* (Memphis) or something corresponding to “White Fort” (*Jnb-ḥd*) or to the place’s putative alternative designation as Wall of Ptah.<sup>101</sup>

line 7 [y]n[h]rw, “[I]n[h]arou”. Driver apparently read this as Anu-daru. Lewis 1958 notes a suggestion from Henning and Kahle that it should be a form of Inaros, and TADAE IV p.135,150 (followed by Lindenberger and this edition) specifically proposed to read [y]n[h]rw: “this name may safely be restored”, apparently on the ground that it has been recognized (though presumed to be referring to a different person) in A6.6:3 (see n. ad loc.). The name is not so rare that we have to identify this troublesome Inaros with the Libyan insurgent of the 450s, though, given that the date-horizon of the Bodleian letters is strictly speaking an open question, the identification is not entirely out of court (see Introduction p.41). Another possibility is that the name was used as an appropriate *nom de guerre* in reference to the rebel of the 450s and/or the anti-Assyrian hero of the Inaros epic cycle. One might compare Amyrtaeus’ apparent adoption of the name Psammetichus, in reference to the Saite founder of the last autonomous pre-Persian dynasty.<sup>102</sup> Or perhaps a man actually called Inaros was stirred to militancy by the historical resonances of his given name?

line 7 *’hd*, “seized”. Whitehead observes that what happened to the workers here is what Arsames wanted Nakhthor to do in A6.10.

line 8 *’mh hww*, “were with him”. Lindenberger renders these words as “and has kept them in custody” which, even by the standards of his often rather free translations, seems extreme. Arshama’s attitude to the Cilicians may presuppose his belief that they were under duress, but it is wrong to misrepresent the vagueness of the text in this fashion. That the Cilicians need to be released (line 9) is a function of what Artavanta (or his agents) have done with them in the meantime, not of their treatment by ?Inaros. The suspicion that the Cilicians had *not* been under duress would not be unnatural, of course: one of the ways we know about shortage of labour (see below, note on line 9) is from evidence about workers absconding. For a spectacular dash for freedom by erstwhile deported labourers in Anatolia cf. Herodotus 5.98.

<sup>98</sup> Gadatas: Cyr.5.2.28, 5.3.12,15,26; 5.4.2-3,9,29, 5.4.4-6; Gobryas: Cyr.4.6.2,9.

<sup>99</sup> This involves associating (a) PF 330, 2027, PFNN 1044, PFNN 1159, PFNN 1254, PFNN 1711, PFNN 1816, R558 = Jones & Stolper 2006, 19 with (b) PF 1857. See Tuplin (forthcoming [a]). But, in fact, either (a) or (b) by itself already provides a linkage of estates and fortresses. See also the introduction to the commentary on A6.9.

<sup>100</sup> Grillot-Susini, Herrenschildt & Malbran-Labat 1993, 53

<sup>101</sup> This alternative name is inferred from the regular epithet “south of his wall”, its replacement by “south of the White Fort” in Verner 2006, 221 no.50, description of the god as “Lord of the White Wall” (P.Harri I) and the statement that Ptah built the White Fort (P.Berl.13603 II.28: Erichsen & Schott 1954, 315).

<sup>102</sup> Chauveau 1996, 47, on the basis of Ain Manawir ostraca, P.Berlin 13571 and Diod.14.35.3f. Note also Ctes.688 F13(10) with Lenfant 2004, lxx.

line 8 *hn 'lyk kwt tb*, “if (it seems) like a good thing to you”.. Compare A6.3:5 (“if (it seems) good to my lord” – *hn `l mr'y tb* [Psamshek to Arshama]), A6.13: 2 (“if it (seems) like a good thing to my lord” – *hn `l mr'y lm kwt tb* [Varuvahya to Arshama]). For cases elsewhere (in the short form, without *kwt*) see A4.5:19,21-2, A4.7:23 = A4.8:22, Ezra 5.17, Neh.2.5. Benveniste 1954, 305 detected translation of a putative OP \**yadiy θuvām avathā kamā* = “s’il te plaît ainsi, si tel est ton bon plaisir”. Whitehead thought the case inconclusive. -- In A6.3 and A6.13 the phrase occurs in the mouth of a subordinate addressing Arshama (albeit one quoted in Arshama’s letter). Even without “lord”, the trope seems a trifle odd when it is Arshama himself addressing Artavanta. It is almost as though the scribe had in mind the missing (cf. n. above) letter to Arshama reporting the Mišpeh Thirteen’s problem and requesting Arshama (if it pleased him) to order that they be spared punishment.

lines 8-9 *'yš* and *b'yš*, “a person....bad”. Whitehead 1974, 187 notes the play on words. For other examples cf. A6.12:2 n.

line 9 *Pym'*, “Pariyama”. A misspelling of *Prym'* (lines 3,7), giving a result that looks like the Aramaic for “thurable” (David Taylor).

line 9 *'bydt'*, “work”. The nature of the “work” is undetermined by the word so that nothing emerges to limit the sort of role “pressers” (see above, note on line 5) might be filling. *'bydt'* occurs in Dan.2.49, 3.12 in phrases saying that someone has been set over the affairs (“work”) of a city/province; in Ezra 6.18 it refers to the “service of God”, and in A4.1:6 it is the work (presumably of any sort) that is not to be done on a holy day. It can even be used in A6.15:9 in a phrase translated as “it is no business of yours” (*lit.* “you and my *grd'*, you have no work” – i.e. there is no task, again potentially unlimited in nature, that you and they might be doing together). Other cases include B2.4:10 (apparently in reference to building a house), and various items in Ahiqar, C1.1:21 (work as counsellor), 127 (“any work” that can earn subsistence), 207 (the “work” of an Arab and a Sidonian are different; the reference is to Sidonian’s concern with sea and Arab’s with – presumably – crossing deserts). -- Grelot 1972, 310 observes that, whatever the truth about the Cilicians’ behaviour, it was prudent not to lose the use of their labour. Worker-shortage, a historically endemic problem in Egypt (as Christopher Eyre has pointed out to me) and one very relevant to Arshama’s instructions in A6.10 as well, was not confined to that region: for Babylon see e.g. Stolper 2003, Janković 2005, Jursa 2010, 726.

line 9 *br byt'*, “prince”. See Introduction pp.21-25.

line 10 *'Rthnt zy b[Mšry]n*, “Artahant who is in [Egypt]”: as elsewhere the question is raised of whether Arshama is not in Egypt. See A6.3:9 n., Introduction pp.26-30.

lines 11-14 *'l Hylky'*, “concerning the Cilicians”. Driver (followed by Grelot) read the subject-statement on the outside of the letter as saying “*concerning Cilicians* who were on *my* domains who did not *succeed* in entering *Mišpeh*”. Of this Porten-Yardeni detect only the words in italics (with a question-mark against the final one).

line 14 *lmšph*, “into Mišpeh(?)”. For some reason the Porten-Yardeni translation ignores *l-*, though its presence is clear. Theoretical alternative readings of the rest of the word are *mhw* or *mšwh* or *mhp* (but not *mnp*: cf. above, note on line 7). The Hebrew word *mišpeh* = watchtower (Isaiah 21.8, 2 Chron.20.24) was also used as a place-name (BDB 859-860), and the same might have been true of an equivalent Aramaic word (Cazelles 1955, 91), though no such word is

independently known to have existed (Driver 1965, 51; Grelot 1972, 308). For a place in Egypt to have an Aramaic proper name (even if only as an alternative to an Egyptian name) seems to entail heavy Semitic presence. If this is the *byrt'* of line 7 (and that is only an assumption, though a reasonable one), this fortress takes on something of the allure of Elephantine or Daphnae, places known or postulated to have been garrisoned by Aramaeo-Judaeans soldiers (though not known to have been given alternative names by those soldiers): indeed such a thought has doubtless helped editors to discern *Mšph* and find a Semitic explanation for it in the first place. It is perhaps marginally more likely that the person who wrote this external summary might have picked a Semitic proper name for the place than that he would suddenly have used an unattested Aramaic common noun *mšph* in place of the normal *byrt'*. But one is entitled to be a little sceptical about the whole thing. In this spirit (presumably -- he makes no comment) Lindenberger prints *lmhwh*, "to be [...]". (He also postulates a negative in the previous line, turning Porten-Yardeni's "succeed" into "were unable", though he does not insert *l'* into his text.)

## A6.8 = Driver 4 = Grelot 65 = Lindenberger 38

### Letter to a military commander

#### Summary

Arshama tells Armapiya, a military commander, to do what Psamshek says in a matter concerning his estate.

#### Date

None given.

#### Text

Essentially unproblematic. Lindenberger (as often) differs slightly from Porten-Yardeni in the positioning of square brackets, in this case at a couple of points in line 3.

#### Relations between officials

Assuming that *hyl* designates a military group (and I see no good evidence to the contrary *pace* Aimé-Giron 1931, 57-62: see below, note on line 1), this letter raises the issue of the relationship of *pqyd* and troops. Driver thought A6.9 (the travel-pass) and A6.15 indicated that the *pqyd* was entitled to have “foreign, presumably mercenary” troops under his command. The argument in the latter case is presumably that Nakhtḥor’s alleged misdeeds entailed the exercise of force.<sup>103</sup> So, one might add, does execution of the task imposed on him in A6.10; and Porten 1968, 55 speculated that military forces might be involved in A6.13/A6.14. But whether any force involved in these cases has to be exercised by *soldiers* is another matter; and I do not understand why A6.9 might be thought to *demonstrate* anything relevant. On the other hand, the possibility that CT 22.74 shows that in Babylonia there were *gardu*-soldiers (LU.ERIN<sub>2</sub>.MEŠ *ša gardu*) should at least enter the discussion here, given that Arshama’s estate is a *locus* for *grd’*.<sup>104</sup> The assumption that A6.8 illuminates the interaction of the public (military) and private (estate) sphere *might* be premature. That said, one might also be inclined to wonder whether Armapiya’s resistance to instruction from Psamshek reflects his sense that – as part of the (public) military infrastructure – he should not be at the beck-and-call of an estate-*pqyd*. The sharpness or otherwise of the public-private divide at satrapal and local governor level is an issue also raised

---

<sup>103</sup> Ray 1988, 271 spoke of Nakhtḥor having his own militia, though he cites no references and was perhaps actually thinking of A6.8, but confusing Psamshek and Nakhtḥor.

<sup>104</sup> CT 22.74 is an important source for Babylonian military resources (and has even been claimed to be linked to military preparations for the eventual suppression of the Ionian revolt: Tolini 2011, 433, dating it to 496/5) but its precise interpretation is tricky and the translations of Ebeling 1949, 44-45, Oppenheim 1967, 143, Joannès 1982, 24-25 (cf. Briant 2002, 342), Abrahams 2004 no.88, Joannès 1990, 187 (cf. Tolini 2011, 429) and Schmidl 2012, 112-113 differ in some respects. The *gardu*-soldiers are one of three groups of soldiers whom Guzanu (once administrator of Ebabbar but now perhaps already *šākin tēmi* of Babylon) considers himself authorized to instruct Marduk-nasir-apli (an entrepreneur who in this matter is effectively his agent) *not* to allow to go with Liblut on a journey to Dapinu. The other two groups are (a) chariot-drivers and *tašlīšu* and (b) soldiers of the *mār bānē*, of whom the former are presumably the same as the “soldiers of my chariot-fief” mentioned right at the end of the letter, while the latter (troops raised from, i.e. essentially paid for by, the notable citizens of Babylon) may have “belonged” to Guzanu in his capacity as *šākin tēmi*. The *gardu*-soldiers (only encountered here) are presumably either *gardu* actually mobilized as soldiers or soldiers paid for by income from *gardu*-held fief-land. It is interesting that it is adjacent to the reference to them that Guzanu threatens his addressee with “the majesty of King Darius” (cf 6.16:1 n.): is this because the *gardu* a part of the royal environment, though also a matter of concern to the *šākin tēmi*? In Joannès 1990 *gardu* is translated “les corvéables”, which seems rather surprising.

by the Bactrian Aramaic letters.<sup>105</sup> A fuller discussion of the military environment of Achaemenid Egypt will appear in Tuplin (forthcoming [d]).

line 1 *mn 'rsm 'l 'rmpy*, “from Arshama to Armapiya”. Armapiya is unique among the Bodleian letters from Arshama in neither having a title nor being labelled “in Egypt”. The same thing occurs with Nakhthor in Artahaya’s letter to him (A6.16).

line 1 *'rmpy*, “Armapiya”. Armapiya is not Iranian (*pace* Eilers 1954/56, 327, still followed by Fried 2013, 324) or Egyptian, but bears an Anatolian name meaning “given by the moon”, already attested in Hittite sources (Laroche 1966, 39 no.135).<sup>106</sup> Grelot 1972, 460 specifically calls him a Cilician, presumably on the grounds that Goetze identified the name as Luwian and therefore potentially Cilician. But the proof that “beginning with the sixth century, Cilician names are consistently Luwian” (Goetze 1962, 54) is not *in se* the proof that Luwian names are consistently Cilician; and this particular name is attested in Lycia (abundantly: over 25 individuals),<sup>107</sup> Caria,<sup>108</sup> Pamphylia<sup>109</sup> and Athens<sup>110</sup> as well as Cilicia.<sup>111</sup> The presence in other letters of (lower-status) people specifically identified as Cilicians should not over-influence us. Given the history of Carian mercenaries in Egypt, one might be tempted to stress the (early) Carian attestations of Ermapis and give him that background.<sup>112</sup> But, statistically speaking, our Armapiya is most likely to be Lycian.<sup>113</sup> In any event, a man with such a name does not have to be a recent arrival in Egypt (any more than one with a Carian or Greek name need be); he might be the latest member of a long-established family of Egyptian residents. Consider, merely *exempli gratia*, one Pirapia (a name of similar formation to Armapiya’s) on record in a bilingual Egyptian-Greek inscription of 600-550 BC putting himself under the protection of Amon and Mut (Lacaze, Masson & Yoyotte 1984, 131-137) -- especially as he seems to have an Egyptian mother.

line 1 *hyl*, “(armed) force”: cf. A6.7: 6 n. Since Armapiya is (apparently) Lycian and certainly not Persian (above) and Psamshek considers (evidently rightly, given Arshama’s response) that, as *pqyd*, he is entitled to expect Armapiya’s complaisance in an estate matter, one should not perhaps take it without comment that the *hyl*’ consists of soldiers. It is true that in the Tale of Ḥor bar Punesh and the Words of Aḥiqar the word can mean strength (C1.2:4<sup>114</sup>) or

<sup>105</sup> Fried 2013, 323, Tuplin (forthcoming [a]). On this theme see also A6.11:7 n., A6.15:1 n.

<sup>106</sup> A name of similar formation appears in the Xanthos Trilingual (Natrbbijēmi = Apollodotus).

<sup>107</sup> SEG 45.1809; SEG 48.1715; SEG 49.1924-1925 (one individual); SEG 55.1491; SEG 56.1722, 1730, 1733 (= Schweyer 2002, 53: two individuals), 1735, 1739, 1751, 1752, 1771 (two individuals); SEG 57.1688; SEG 57.1689; Schweyer 2002, 49; LBW 1302 = CIG 4303 Add. h<sup>4</sup>: a4,7, b6-7; Gardner 1885, 357 (121); TAM i 139 (SEG 45.1788), 156, 176a, 515, 523, 530, 765; TAM ii 25; TAM ii 30; Petersen-von Luschan 1889, 108a (= CIG 4303 Add. e:2), 179; Zgusta 1964, 92 (a female form). Note also *Armpa* in TAM i 68: Zgusta 1964, §97-17 n.365 seems dubious about the form, Melchert 1993 s.v. makes no demur, and neither broaches the relationship to Armapiya.

<sup>108</sup> SIG<sup>3</sup> 46a39 (new text: Blümel 1993), I.Mylasa 12 (SEG 40.992), I.Mylasa 882.

<sup>109</sup> SEG 17.571.

<sup>110</sup> IG ii<sup>2</sup> 7316.

<sup>111</sup> Zgusta 1964, 92; Heberdey & Wilhelm 1896, 165; Keil & Wilhelm 1931, 70 (no.70). (There may be some overlap of family or individual between the last two items.)

<sup>112</sup> According to the list in Houwink ten Cate 1961, 132-4 Ermapis is the only Arma- formed name found in Caria. – The frequency of Armapiya’s attestation in Greek form contrasts with the lack of immediately apparent surviving Greek analogues to the Cilician names in A6.7.

<sup>113</sup> Kitchen 1965 found another possible Lycian in Kenzasirma/Kendasirma (A6.11-14): A6.11.1 n.

<sup>114</sup> Thus Hoftijzer & Jongeling s.v. *hyl*’, and recognized as one option in Porten 2004, 459.

wealth (C1.1:137),<sup>115</sup> that the *hyl'* of Assyria in C1.1:55,61 might be something other than its army, and in some Biblical contexts, whether Aramaic (Dan.4.32) or Hebrew (1 Sam.10.26, 1 Kings 10.2 = 2 Chron.9.1), it may designate a non-military (or not wholly military) host. On the other hand *hyl'* is used repeatedly in the Aramaic version of DB to describe people fighting in battles. The *hyl'* of which we hear in Elephantine documents must be the one of which the Iranians entitled *rb hyl'* were in charge and, for all that they are regularly encountered in judicial functions, there can be no reasonable doubt the *hyl'* involved has a military character: it is surely service as soldiers that entitled the Syenian *hyl'* to receive food-rations (C3.14). The fact that a list of donations for the god YHW in C3.15 describes the donors as the Jewish *hyl'* or that Ananiah writes to the Jewish *hyl'* about Unleavened Bread and Passover observance (A4.1:1) does not demilitarize the word. It simply parallels the way that individual Jews (even occasionally Jewish women: B5.5:2) self-identify in contracts as belonging to a specific *degel* (an unimpeachably military term). *Mutatis mutandis* the same goes for the linkage between *hyl'* and agricultural land (cf. A6.13:3 n.) -- another epiphenomenon of military organisation, not a sign that the word *hyl'* is sufficiently devoid of intrinsic military reference to enable its use of entirely non-military groups. Similarly, although explicit soldiers are elusive in the Elamite texts of the Persepolis Fortification archive,<sup>116</sup> it would beg questions to react to the presence of *hyl'* in its Aramaic texts (PFAT 051, 054, 186, 200) by seeking to generalize the word's semantic range to take in e.g. groups of workers (which, of course, abound in the archive), especially as (i) *rb hyl'* (PFAT 206, 210) and *degel* (PFAT 014) also occur and (ii) the Persepolis Aramaic texts already have perfectly good terms for workers (*gbr, grd'*).<sup>117</sup> In short: we have no good reason to doubt that Armapiya was a commander of soldiers – though how many and of what recruitment-category we cannot tell. (See below, next note.)

Building on his military association, some have wanted to see Armapiya as (also) some sort of local governor: so Fried 2013, 324, making him analogous to Bagavant in Bactria. To sustain that one would have to hold both that Psamshek defined him solely in relation to the *hyl'* because deployment of military force was all that was relevant and that Arshama simply followed suit in formulating his ensuing letter to Armapiya. *Perhaps* this is possible, but it is not greatly appealing.

A *hyl'* also appears in A6.7 taking refuge in a fortress. Is it a reasonable application of Ockham's Razor or just begging the question to suggest that this is the same *hyl'* as that commanded by Armapiya? Can we assume that the Bodleian letters have a fairly narrow geographical horizon? Arshama had estates in Upper and Lower Egypt, but are *these* letters only concerned with one part of the country – and indeed with one part of that part, the series of *pqydyn* involved actually being responsible for a relatively limited area? Porten 1968, 54-55

<sup>115</sup> Both have analogues in Biblical Hebrew (BDBG 298-299).

<sup>116</sup> For some probable implicit ones cf. A6.7:7 n. on Ukama. Nor are the fortresses associated with Ukama the only ones in the archive, and the existence of such places in general entails soldiers of *some* sort. Some of the archive's other *taššup* ("personnel": a word also linked with Ukama – and used in military contexts in the Elamite version of DB) could be military, even if the term does often have other references (Tuplin 2008, 369-371). It is a more intrinsically neutral word than *hyl'*.

<sup>117</sup> Aimé-Giron 1921, 59 and 1931, 57-62 sought to problematize the word's purely military character, suggesting that, like Akkadian *šabe* (or indeed OP *kara*), it might designate any (organised?) collection of people, and proposing that in Elephantine it should be translated "colony" or even "quarter". Oddly he cited in support of this Herodotus' references to a *stratopedon Tyriôn* in Memphis (Hdt.2.112) and the *stratopeda* in the Eastern Delta (Hdt.2.154). These places, like Elephantine, doubtless involved a community, not just a group of adult male soldiers. But the Greek designation represents a contemporary perception that we have no reason to jettison – and Greeks were not in the habit of using *stratopedon* of non-military entities.

seemed to think differently -- taking Nakhtḥor as *pqyd* for [all of] Lower Egypt, the “Mazdaean” (actually, Masdayašna) of A4.2 as *pqyd* for [all of] “the province of Ne, Upper Egypt” (which I understand as identifying Ne and Upper Egypt) and Psamshek as having “jurisdiction over estates in both Upper and Lower Egypt” -- but A6.11 explicitly has a plurality of *pqydn* in Lower Egypt, so it is not easy to sustain Porten’s view. (On the geographical labelling of Egyptian *pqydn* cf. 6.4:2 n.) But even on the alternative view we might still be dealing with a region large enough to embrace more than one military force. The fact that A6.7 is not linked with any specific *pqyd* does not make the problem any easier. On *pqydn* in general cf. A6.4:2 n.

line 1 *’rmpy...lydh*, “Armapiya with the (armed) force which is at his control”. We thus have a non-Iranian and non-Egyptian in some position of command in the military establishment within Egypt. Known analogies for such a situation -- to be distinguished from that of the non-Iranian commanders of (i) non-Iranian contingents in royal or other field-armies operating across satrapal boundaries and (ii) non-Iranian forces operating in their own ethnic area (e.g. the Bithynians of *Xen.An.6.5.30*) -- are not that numerous. They include:

- Onomastically Babylonian *degel*-commanders at Elephantine<sup>118</sup>
- Trkmn’ or Trknh, the Pisidian *rbh* (D22.25,27) – assuming he was either based in Abydos or visiting it from elsewhere in Egypt *and* that *rbh* reliably connotes a *military* leader
- Leonymus in Carian Caunus: *Hell.Oxy. 23* (Chambers)
- Commanders of Carian and Greek troops in Phrygian Celaenae in *Arr.1.29*
- Betis in Gaza – if he is an Arab and if we do not regard Gaza as part-Arab (*Plut.Alex. 25*, *Arr.2.26-27*, *Curt. 4.6.7-31*)
- The commander of the “Assyrian” hoplites from Komania in the Caicus Valley (*Xen.An.7.8.15*)
- Sectional commanders of Mardian, Chaldaean, Chalybian and Taochian groups in Armenia (*Xen.An.4.2.4*, *4.4.18*), some or all encountered outside their native area

It is a nice question whether Greeks encountered in Greek communities other than their own count, i.e. people such as

- Alexander the phourarch in *Polyaenus 6.10*
- Hippias in *Thuc.3.34*
- Lycomedes in Mytilene in *Arr.2.1.5*
- Cyprothemis in Samos (*Harpoc.*, *Phot.*, *Suda s.v.*)
- Xenias and others in command of garrisons in “the cities” (*Xen.An.1.1.6*, *1.2.3* etc.)

The message of all such cases (when we can tell at all) is that the troops Armapiya commands are unlikely to include Iranians.

line 2 *bšbwt mr’y*, “in the affair of my lord”. In his reply (see n. below) Arshama rephrases this as “affair of my estate” (*šbwt byt’*). So whatever it was, it is not primarily (presented as) a matter of official or satrapal concern. Perhaps this is why Armapiya has been initially resistant to doing what Psamshek tells him – though it may beg the question to assume either that the distinction matters much where a satrap is concerned or that Armapiya’s non-cooperation was reasonable in the first place. In the light of A6.10 one might postulate that Armapiya was being asked to help Psamshek precisely to assist in estate-enhancement. The idea of soldiers being asked to do other-than-purely-military things momentarily evokes the

<sup>118</sup> Iddin-nabu: B 2.6, B2.9, B3.6, B3.8, B6.1, B7.1; Nabu-kudurri: B3.12, B3.13, B4.5, B4.6, B7.2. Perhaps also Nabu-šezib at Saqqara (B8.4).

Bactrian letters, where ADAB A4 seems to speak of soldiers being allowed to go home to gather crops before a swarm of locusts arrive, while A2 perhaps speaks of soldiers protecting markets (and building walls). But these may only be rather inexact parallels for the present document (see Tuplin [forthcoming (a)]). Similarly, although students of Babylonian material may feel that the boundaries between military and labour service can seem rather porous, that also is not certainly relevant here. However, the *gardu*-soldiers of CT 22.74 (see above) must be kept in mind. A different sort of analogy for the interplay between estate- and state-officials may be provided by ADAB A6, in which it emerges that the local governor Bagavant has been told (but has failed) to do some tasks (house-roofing; delivery of grain) that appear to relate to the satrap Akhvamazda's estate: at any rate, Bagavant's penalty, if he continues to fail to act, involves paying "the whole amount from your *byt'* to the my *byt'*" (ADAB A6.10). – Psamshek could not control his father's slaves (A6.3) and now cannot keep Armapiya in line. Perhaps he sometimes had a problem exerting his authority – though evidently not always, on the showing of his success during the rebellion of A6.10. (But, crises can be easier to deal with than ordinary business.)

line 2 *šbwt byt' zyly*, "the affair of my estate". Lindenberger's translation has Psamshek speak of "my lord's affairs" and Arshama tell Armapiya to obey orders "in *any* matter concerning my household" (my italics), thus generalizing Arshama's instruction and (perhaps) the nature of Psamshek's complaint. Porten-Yardeni, by contrast, leave one to assume that a single specific issue is all that is at stake in this particular letter and therefore that Arshama is not issuing a blanket instruction. (Grelot took the same view, as probably did Driver.) It is interesting that Arshama refers to something that Psamshek is going to tell Armapiya in the future (*ymr*); he does not just say "obey Psamshek in the matter he has (already) told you about", which might tell in Lindenberger's favour. I am less sure whether the letter's failure to provide details of any specific issue (and the fact that the external summary is couched in such general terms that Armapiya is not even mentioned) prove that Psamshek is making a generic complaint and receiving general authority to order Armapiya about. But it has to be admitted that none of the other letters is so vague about its subject matter, and I wonder if we can reasonably assume that in the present case Arshama, Psamshek and Armapiya are all so clear about what is involved (either because it is at the front of their minds or because they can recover information easily from filed documents) that it does not need to be spelled out.

line 3 *kn ydy' yhwh lk*, "thus let it be known to you". The turn-of-phrase recurs in A6.10:8, ADAB A6.8 (in both cases again as the preliminary to a threat), ADAB B3.4, Dan.3.18 and Ezra 4.12,13,5.8 and perhaps 7.24 (Makujina 2001, 179), as well as further afield (see Whitehead ad loc. and Makujina 2001). Benveniste 1954, 305 suggested, without further comment, that this reproduces a putative OP turn of phrase *\*avathātaiy azdā biyā* (presumably modelled on DNa §4: *adataiy azdā bavāti*). The Bactrian parallel underlines the feeling that we are dealing with a cliché of Persian bureaucratic style, and perhaps slightly improves the chances that it has a Persian linguistic background. The fact that another admonitory cliché, *'nrwy 'l t'bdw* ("do not act in contrary manner"), encountered three times in the Bactrian letters (A5:2-3, A6.5, B7.3), contains what seems to be an Iranian loan-word (*'nrwy* = *\*anya-ravi(a)*: Naveh & Shaked 2012, 105) may be noted here. Makujina notes that what he rather charmingly calls the "sense of sobriety and reverential warning" associated with use of the phrase is absent in the case of comparable Hebrew syntagms, suggesting that its Aramaic instantiation may be a special adaptation.

line 3 *'hr*, "afterwards". See A6.7:6,7 n.

line 3 *qblt mnk yšlt 'ly*, “send me a complaint about you”. A6.15:5, 11 (“he has sent a complaint against you”, “so that Masapata shall not again send a complaint against you”) are very similar. Elsewhere both Psamshek (A6.3:1) and Varuvahya (A6.14:1) complain (*qbl*) about (respectively) runaway slaves and Nakhtḥor. Porten 2011, 161 n.14 takes the view that, in the administrative/legal world of the Elephantine documents, making a complaint is a different thing from instituting a suit or process, and he thus at least implicitly ascribes to “complaint” a distinct technical status. Is there an element of this in the language of the Bodleian letters -- and indeed ADAB 1, where complaints are repeatedly made about Bagavant? The apparent feebleness of A6.15:10-11 (Nakhtḥor is to restore goods to the *grd'* of Virafsha's wife “so that Masapata will not send complaint again against you”) when compared with 7-8, where Virafsha tells Nakhtḥor to restore property to Masapata so it can be added to Virafsha's estate “lest, when you come here, you will pay damages for what you took and be called to account (*tšt'l*) about this” (not to mention the fact that this latter threat is the response to a complaint Masapata has already sent) might be mitigated if “send complaint” is understood to bear special weight as a technically specific act. The fact that we are here in a nexus of *clichés* (see next note) may favour this viewpoint, though we should also remember that the nature of the Bodleian collection and the archives from Elephantine inevitably privileges (and perhaps does so misleadingly) association of *qbl* and denunciation to officials of one sort or another.

line 3 *tštl*, “questioned”. cf. A6.10:9 (next to the threat of a *gst ptgm*), A6.15:8 (next to a warning to avoid being the object of complaint), ADAB A1:3 (alongside the statement that as a consequence of interrogation a *ptgm* was sent to Bagavant) and 10 (in Akhvamazda's eventual response to the litany of complaint about Bagavant). These four letters are playing the changes on interconnecting *clichés*. Naveh & Shaked (2012, 51,77), after Benveniste 1954, 304-5 and Driver 1965, 50, suggest that this use of *š'l* is a calque of an OP expression using the verb *fras-* “which is often associated with judicial enquiry which ends in punishment” (with the result that MP *padefrah* actually = “punishment”).

lines 3-4 *gst ptgm*, “severe sentence”. Armapiya is told that, in the event of further complaints about his behaviour, “you will be strongly questioned and a *gasta \*patigama* will be done to you”. The same happens to Nakhtḥor in A6.10:9. *Gasta* and *\*patigama* are certainly Iranian words but questions have been raised about their precise significance. There are two (in principle separate) issues: (a) how should we translate *gst ptgm* and (b) what the phrase signifies.

*Gasta* is directly attested in OP and can properly be translated “evil”. Like the English word “evil”, it can apparently be used both as a noun and as an adjective.<sup>119</sup> It figures in various royal inscriptions in reference to the evil from which the king wishes to be protected or the evil that the reader should *not* think the command of Ahuramazda to be.<sup>120</sup> This is ideologically high-level stuff, but it is not certain that the choice of *gasta* (or of the words used in the parallel Akkadian and Elamite versions<sup>121</sup>) is the choice of authors looking for vocabulary with an exceptionally strong colour.<sup>122</sup>

<sup>119</sup> See DNa §5 (noun) and §6 (adjective).

<sup>120</sup> DNa §5 and §6, XPh §7, A<sup>2</sup>Sa §3 and AHa (at the end).

<sup>121</sup> In almost all cases the Babylonian equivalent is *bīšu* and the Elamite *mušnuḳ* or *mišnuḳ*, though in DNa §6 the Babylonian version renders the original more loosely: “let the command of Ahuramazda not seem *gasta*” becomes “let what Ahuramazda commands not cause you annoyance”, using the verb *marāṣu*, a very general word for causing concern, annoyance, trouble, illness or the like. (Oddly enough the examples cited in CAD include YOS 3.63, a neo-Babylonian document in which someone complains that his representatives are not doing what they should be. He tells them to give some cattle to Eanna, threatening that otherwise “there will be trouble for you” (*janu inna muhhikunu imarrus*) -- very similar

Unlike *gasta*, \**patigama* is not directly attested in OP, but is reconstructed from its reflections in Elamite, Aramaic, Hebrew and Armenian as well as from later forms of Iranian. In texts from or directly related to the Achaemenid era it characteristically designates something that is said or sent as a “report”, “message”, “answer” or “order”.<sup>123</sup> The suggestion that in Daniel 3.16 and 4.14 it means “affair” or “matter” does not in itself seem specially cogent<sup>124</sup> and the claim could not in any case stand against the unanimous impression of the many other texts that are much more directly relevant to the Bodleian letters.

In the light of all of this it seems natural to understand *gst ptgm* as referring to some sort of bad verbal communication, and this is reflected in the translations of *gst ptgm yt'bd lk* (literally “*gst ptgm* will be done to you”) as “thou wilt be ... reprimanded” (Driver) or “a harsh word will be directed at you” (Porten-Yardeni). But other translations have, nonetheless, been proposed.

One approach is to change the relationship between *gst* and *ptgm*. This is exemplified by Whitehead’s translation, “sentence will be passed on you for your crime”, in which *gst* is treated as a noun, not an adjective.<sup>125</sup> The argument for this<sup>126</sup> is based on a parallel with *Ecclesiastes* 8.11. That text reads *asher ein na'asah pitgam ma'aseh hara'a meherah*, which is literally something like “because not is-done a *pitgam* of the deed-of-evil quickly” and is normally understood to mean “because sentence against an evil deed is not given / carried out quickly”.<sup>127</sup> The suggestion seems to be that *pitgam ma'aseh hara'a* is actually a reflection of *gst ptgm*<sup>128</sup> and therefore dictates how the latter phrase ought to be translated. *Ecclesiastes* certainly reached its current form late enough for this to be possible, but I cannot help feeling

---

to the DN<sub>a</sub> phrase but also oddly evocative of Arshama threatening Nakhthor with a *gasta patigama*.) None of these translations suggests that in itself *gasta* had a *very* special set of overtones.

<sup>122</sup> Still, Lincoln 2012, 249-250 detects a link between Akkadian *bīšu*, which *inter alia* means “malodorous”, and the derivation of *gasta* from Iranian \**gand-* or *gant-* = “to stink”, the overtone being the stench of demonic activity.

<sup>123</sup> Tavernier 2007, 410. Elamite: *battikama(š)*, appears in many Persepolis Fortification texts in the local version of the letter-subscriptions discussed in Appendix 1. In that context its effective Aramaic equivalent is *t'm*, another word for “order”. Egyptian Aramaic: B8.8, D1.28, D1.32, D7.39. All these texts are very fragmentary, but at least three have allure of officialdom: interrogation and a possible Persian name in B8.8; imprisonment in D1.32; a reference to Pherendates – presumably the early fifth century satrap of that name – in D7.39. The co-presence of *ptgm* and interrogation (the same verb *s'l* found in the first part of the sentence of which *gst ptgm* in the Bodleian letters) in B8.8 is notable. Bactrian Aramaic: ADAB A1:4, describing something issued as a consequence of satrapal interrogation (*s'l* again). Biblical Aramaic: *Ezra* 4.17, 5.7, 11, 6.11. (In 6.11 it is contextually synonymous with *t'm*. In 4.17, 5.7, 6.11 the reference is to reports or orders by a king or a satrap, whereas in 5.11 it describes the response of the Jews to satrapal questions about the authorization for temple-reconstruction, though whether that means it has to be *translated* “answer” is perhaps debatable.) In post-Achaemenid Aramaic and in Syriac *ptgm* becomes a standard and fully naturalized word.

<sup>124</sup> For *Dan*.4.14 see below. In *Dan*.3.16 cannot the text (*la ḥšḥyn 'nh nh 'l dnh ptgm lhtbwtk*) mean “we do not need to respond to this command” or (more plausibly?) “.... return a *ptgm* to this” (cf. *Ezra* 5.11) – in both cases preserving the association of *ptgm* with verbal communication? -- An apparently similar view, that *gst ptgm* means “bad thing”, is cited by Greenfield 1982, 9 from Kutscher 1944/45 (*nondum vidi*).

<sup>125</sup> A similar view is taken by Herrenschildt 1990, 203.

<sup>126</sup> Derived from Rabinowitz 1960. (Greenfield 1982 also discussed *Eccles*.8.11 in this context: see below.) Rabinowitz also claimed that *ḥsn tšt'l* means “accused of violence”, rather than “strictly questioned”.

<sup>127</sup> The Massoretic accentuation would give “because sentence is not carried out, the work of evil is quick”, but it is widely agreed that this accentuation must be emended. See e.g. Seow 1997, 286-7.

<sup>128</sup> Rabinowitz 1960, 74 spoke of the author of *Ecclesiastes* using a legal cliché.

that, since *gasta \*patigama* is an Iranian phrase (and one used by an Iranian speaker, viz. Arshama, albeit transmitted through an Aramaic environment) and since *gasta* can certainly be an adjective, we are entitled to wonder whether we need the Hebrew Bible to explain it to us – or at least whether it does so reliably.

A different approach is found in Greenfield 1982, whose view is that *gst ptgm* should be translated “punishment”.<sup>129</sup> The argument runs as follows.<sup>130</sup> (a) The sentence in A6.8 and A6.10 containing the phrase *gst ptgm* (“you will be strictly questioned and a *gasta patigama* will be done to you”) must signify more than reprimand because the letters in question are already reprimands;<sup>131</sup> and even Driver acknowledged that, in “you will pay for what you took and will be questioned”, A6.15 “you will be questioned” might really mean “you will be punished” (though he translated it “called to account”). It follows that *both* parts of the sentence in A6.8 and A6.10 mean “you will be severely punished”. (b) *Ecclesiastes* 8.11 indirectly demonstrates that *gst ptgm 'bd* means to “execute punishment”. (c) *Daniel* 4.14 seems to mean (fairly literally) “by decree (*zgrt*) of the watchers (was) the *patigama* and (by?) the word (*m'mr*) of the wise (was) the *š'lt*” Since the reference of this sentence is to the preceding dream-vision description of Nebuchadnezzar’s punishment, both *ptgm* and *s'lt* must mean “penalty” or “punishment”; and, since the co-appearance of *ptgm* and the root *slt* recalls A6.8 and A6.10, the passage confirms that those texts must work in the same way.

But this argument is not decisively cogent. (a) In 6.8 and A6.10 Arshama is indeed criticizing Nakhthor, but he is also offering him another chance to get things right. There is nothing about the logic of the situation that precludes that the phrase means “you will be questioned and a *gasta patigama* will be done to you” – two separate elements of a future eventuality – or that the second of those elements consists of some sort of more formal critical statement. Similarly the crucial sentence in A6.15 says what will happen in the future if Nakhthor does not do what Virafsha is now telling him to do; and what will happen is that he *will* return the wine and grain that is in contention (i.e. Virafsha’s current instruction *will* eventually be enforced) *and* that he will undergo something further. That something might be punishment – or it might be further interrogation or accounting (with, no doubt, the prospect of punishment). The logic of the situation does not require one rather than the other, and the lexical meaning of *tšt'l* points to the latter.<sup>132</sup> Since *tšt'l* in A6.15 does not have to mean “punished”, the argument that *gst ptgm* must also mean “punished” (on the grounds that “punished and reprimanded” would be bathetic) does not work. (b) The claim here is that in *Ecclesiastes* 8.11 the Hebrew phrase *sh ptgm* is an abbreviated equivalent of Aramaic phrase *gst ptgm 'bd*. But neither this nor anything else establishes that *ptgm* cannot mean “sentence”

<sup>129</sup> Compare Grelot: “une sanction te sera appliquée”. Lindenberger’s “you will be severely disciplined” seems to be in this tradition, though the presence of “severely” suggests that for him *ptgm* by itself means “punishment”, which may indeed (cf. next n.) be what Greenfield means (Naveh & Shaked 2012, 73 take that to be his view of *Ecclesiastes* 8.11). Siegal 2011, 217, who regards *gst* as an adverb (“harshly”) – a feminine adjectival form used as an adverb (for the phenomenon, described slightly differently and *not* applied to *gst* cf. Muraoka & Porten 2003, 93) – is perhaps presuming a translation such as Lindenberger’s. (He does not say, being interested only in the grammatical point.)

<sup>130</sup> To some extent this is an interpretative gloss on Greenfield’s discussion, which is succinct and slightly obscure at some points.

<sup>131</sup> Grelot 1972, 305 n.d. makes a similar point and translates *gst ptgm* as “une sanction”, though he continues to think that the first part of the sentence means something different (“tu en rendras compte”).

<sup>132</sup> For the word (here in the form *š'ylt*) in a slightly different procedural context (and one that is more plainly formally legal) cf. B7.2: 6. Here too it means “question” or “call to account”, though Rabinowitz 1958 gave it the more specific sense “accuse”.

or that we are forced to abandon the association of *ptgm* and verbal utterance.<sup>133</sup> (c) In Daniel 4.14 Greenfield himself concedes that *ptgm* might be “sentence” and there seems no obvious reason why *s’lt’* should not be “accounting”. The fact the preceding verses give a metaphorical (dream-vision) account of Nebuchadnezzar’s punishment does not rule out the possibility that this verse is entirely concerned with the decreeing of that punishment. If there is an element of tautology, it is not one about which Greenfield could complain, since he himself is content to postulate tautology.

If, then, we should stick with the basic translation “bad report/order” for *gst ptgm*, there is still the (separate) question of what this signifies. Is this a threat to issue a formal reprimand or to issue an order for Nakht̥or to be punished in some particular fashion (the nature of which would be specified in the *ptgm*)? Granted that *ptgm* connotes verbal utterance, what sort of utterance is it – statement or order?

One thing that has influenced answers to this is the verb *yt’bd*. In both A6.8 and A6.10 the threat is that “a bad word will be done to you”.<sup>134</sup> “Done” is rather non-specific, but the fact that it is a doing-word, not a saying-word, might seem to indicate that something more than saying is involved – something in which Nakht̥or will be the victim of hostile *action* not just of hostile words. But a moment’s reflection suggests that this is not necessarily correct. One could just as well hold that *’bd* is a relatively neutral word and takes its content precisely from the saying content of *ptgm*.<sup>135</sup> To treat *yt’bd* as settling the issue between “reprimand” and “order-for-punishment” (*alias* “sentence”) is to beg the question.

In A6.8 and A6.10 *gst ptgm* occurs together with a threat of interrogation or being called to account (*t’štl*). That conjunction may have occurred in the now fragmentary B8.8; the document certainly contained references to interrogation and used the word *ptgm*, but the inclusion of both ideas in a single sentence (so that someone is questioned and a *ptgm* is then uttered) is the result of editorial restoration. A more effective parallel occurs in one of the Bactrian letters (ADAB A1:4), where the result of questioning seems to be the uttering of a *ptgm*. But it is not a *gst ptgm* and its precise content is not clear. The word *ptgm* is used because it is an appropriate word for any authoritative utterance by a satrap. That is true in Arshama’s case as well, but it does not get us any further. One might be inclined in the light of evidence from Saqqara and Bactria to say that there is a formulaic (or cliché) quality to the conjunction of *s’l* and *ptgm*.<sup>136</sup> But that only underlines the extent to which the force of the cliché in this particular case depends on the precise import of adding *gst* to *ptgm*.

Because *gst ptgm* (unlike *tš’tl*) is linguistically Iranian it is tempting to take the observation about formulaic quality a step further and identify *gst ptgm* as a cliché or technical term in its own right, one whose content is a given for the author and recipient of the letter but not necessarily capable of being inferred by an outside observer. The use of *yt’bd* (“will be done”) rather than *yt’mr* (“will be said”) could certainly be seen as another sign of this: the more *gst ptgm* is (virtually) a code for something, the easier it is to

<sup>133</sup> Note that Greenfield’s point about *Ecclesiastes* 8.11 is different from Whitehead’s. Whitehead is concerned with the relationship between *pitgam* and *ma’aseh hara’a* and does not doubt that *pitgam* means “sentence” (i.e. is a species of verbal utterance), whereas Greenfield is wanting *pitgam* to become “punishment”. But usage of the verb *’asah* (do, make) does not seem to require this.

<sup>134</sup> In Siegal’s view (2011, 217), of course, we have “an order [punishment?] will be done to you harshly”.

<sup>135</sup> That would be implicit in treating use of *’bd* here as an Iranism in its own right: cf. A6.3:6-8 n.

<sup>136</sup> This also, incidentally, draws one’s attention to the distinction between A6.8/10 and A6.15. In the latter case Virafsha threatens Nakht̥or with interrogation but not the utterance of a *ptgm* (bad or otherwise). Is that because he actually has no real authority over Nakht̥or (who is Arshama’s *pqyd*) and therefore feels inhibited from threatening the determination of the case (in the form of a *ptgm*) that is Arshama’s sole prerogative?

understand that the operative verb means “do” or “execute”.<sup>137</sup> At the same time, though tempting, this approach is not perhaps absolutely necessary. Part of what is at issue here is the question is the nature of the “rules” that govern importation of Iranian words and phrases into the Aramaic text. Should we start from the presumption that what causes the composer of the Aramaic text to retain Iranian phraseology rather than translating it is normally that it has some technical quality? The answer to this is probably essentially in the affirmative, but that does not preclude occasional exceptions or half-exceptions. Is it possible, for example, that in the present case the *point* about *gst ptgm* is that it is opaque, a turn of phrase that might mean reprimand or might portend something nastier -- a choice about which Nakht̥or would be (precisely) in the dark. The best argument against this is probably that Arshama uses it twice. But perhaps that only proves that it is a cliché still in the making.

The upshot seems to be, then, that we can translate *gst ptgm* but not be absolutely sure what it means. The strongest argument in favour of “order for punishment” is that the alternative, “formal reprimand”, seems to entail that Nakht̥or is a functionary with a service-record on file into which some sort of formal black mark can be entered. It is not impossible that there were parts of the administrative environment in which such a thing can be envisaged. But I am unsure whether someone like Nakht̥or belongs in one of those parts.<sup>138</sup> In the spirit of the suggestion made at the end of the previous paragraph one could, of course, speculate that, in threatening Nakht̥or with a *gst ptgm*, Arshama was deliberately mixing categories and thereby leaving his *pqyd* uncertain about what he really meant. I suspect, however, that such speculation would be thought unreasonably imaginative. The safer conclusion is probably that Arshama was threatening to issue an order for Nakht̥or to be punished.<sup>139</sup>

line 4 *Bgsrw...spr*, “Bagasrava.....scribe”: See appendix 1.

line 4 *'Hppy*, “Aḥpepi”. This reading (Driver, TADAE) gives the Egyptian name Aḥpepi (interpreted as *3h+pp.y*, “Pepi is wonderful”: Grelot 1972, 463) -- otherwise unknown and rather unexpectedly based on the name of a Sixth Dynasty king. But the photograph and the TADAE drawing suggest that the third and fourth letters are not the same, and the alternative reading *'Hwpy* (incorporated in Porten & Lund 2002, 320) is palaeographically attractive, though the resulting name is described in Porten 2003, 174 as unexplained.

line 7-8 *'mr l' mštm'nm ly*, “[Psamshek] said: ‘they do not obey me’”. Whitehead came up with a quite different reading, viz. *qbylh šlh ly* “[Psamshek] sending me a complaint”. The clearest letters in l.7 are certainly the *l* and *š* that the two readings have in common. Whitehead’s claim that there is not room for two letters between them (as postulated in the Porten-Yardeni reading) is not obviously right (and the photograph seems to show two letters), but that the second of

<sup>137</sup> In ADAB 1:4, by contrast, we *do* have the verb *'myr*; but there it is only a *ptgm*, not a *gst ptgm*.

<sup>138</sup> In A6.10 the threat encompassed people besides Nakht̥or (see below), but that is not true in A6.8 so the appropriateness of a black mark on a personal file does have to be assessed in relation to Nakht̥or.

<sup>139</sup> By way of comparison Babylonian letter writers tend to threaten reference to a higher authority (YOS 3.48,95,106, CT 22.105, 150, BIN 1.38, Millard & Jursa 1997/8, 164 lines 29f ) or to invoke the prospect of punishment by the king or satrap or gods or city (see Kleber 68-71, with a list of texts to which add e.g. YOS 6.151, YBC 7414, BM 74463). The problematic phrase in CT 22.74, CT 22.244 (discussed in A6.16:2 (n.)) also belongs in this context. The tropes of threat in Babylonian epistolography will be discussed further in Jursa (forthcoming).

them is a *m* is certainly debatable. Fitting five letters in after the *š* might also (as Whitehead says) be difficult.

## A6.9 = Driver 6 = Grelot 67 = Lindenberger 41

### Travel authorization

#### Summary

Arshama authorizes daily travel rations for Nakhtor and thirteen others on a trip to Egypt.

#### Date

None given.

#### Text

The text is generally well-preserved. But two toponyms, the name of one *pqyd* and the identity of one element in Nakhtor's daily ration resist interpretation.

#### The character and structure of the document

This might be called an open letter in the sense it was not folded and sealed – the reason presumably being that its contents had to be shown to various people in the course of the journey.<sup>140</sup> The concept of an “open letter” appears in Nehemiah 6.5, where Sanballat sends a servant to Nehemiah with an open letter (*iggeret petuchah*) written in his own hand, accusing Nehemiah of engaging in rebellion and asking (for the fifth time) for a meeting. In this case the openness is not a product of bureaucracy but a wish to ensure that the threatening content became widely known and/or to express contempt for Nehemiah (as a letter to such a prominent person ought to properly folded, sealed and bagged). Whatever the merits of those explanations, A6.9's unsealed state is a practical necessity for a document that needs to be opened regularly. But there is a slight conundrum. Persepolitan provision-authorisations were sealed (at least, they were referred to as *halmi* = seal, hence sealed document) and one might wonder whether it is odd that Nakhtor did not have to show something other than a document which (in principle) anyone could have written. Did he carry an imprint of Arshama's seal separately? Perhaps the Persepolitan phrase “he carried a seal of Parnaka” should be interpreted more literally?

The letter is not, of course, in the binary report-and-instruction mode. Rather there is an element of ring-composition, with

“And now, behold, (one) named Nakhtor, my official, is going to Egypt. You, give him rations from my estate which is in your province, day by day”

corresponding to

“Give them this ration, each official in turn, according to the route which is from province to province until he reaches Egypt. And if he be in one place more than one day then for those days do not give them extra rations”

This may have a bearing on interpretation of “until he reaches Egypt”: cf. below, note on line 5.

#### Long-distance travel

Whatever one's view about the nature of the *pqydn* and the precise relationship of the present document to state provision of foodstuffs to authorized travellers, this letter certainly enters the general dossier of evidence about (long-distance) travel in the empire and its logistical implications. See Almagor (forthcoming), Henkelman (forthcoming). Alongside the evidence

---

<sup>140</sup> This observation was already made in Whitehead 1974, 14 n.1, 60, 157 n.2. Of course, letters *can* be folded, opened and reclosed (this has happened to one of the Bactrian letters recently), but doing so repeatedly would presumably endanger the parchment's integrity (Lindsay Allen).

provided by the Persepolis archive, archaeology and Greek texts,<sup>141</sup> one may note the contribution of other Aramaic documentation.

The correct way to interpret the Arad ostraca (Naveh 1981) is not beyond dispute, but it is possible that some of the outgoing recorded therein were given to people passing through the region rather than to residents (Naveh 1981, 175-6, Tuplin 1987, 186-7, Briant 2002, 365, 448, Briant 2009, 155) and even that these passers-by were sometimes military in character. The (direct) link between other South Palestinian document-sets (Beersheba, Makkedah<sup>142</sup>) or scattered finds<sup>143</sup> and the sustenance of (official) travellers is on the whole less clear: but an indirect link is always possible inasmuch as such documents reveal places at which foodstuff commodities were accumulated – and therefore might also have been disbursed or sent elsewhere for disbursement.

The Bactrian letters (ADAB), on the other hand, certainly enter the discussion, even if their information is, in various ways, tantalising.

- C1 is a (long) list of the diverse provisions (*dwš'hr* = *\*dauša-xwār(a)* = *viaticum*) received by Bayasa (i.e. Bessus) at Maithanka during a trip from Bactra to Varnu, including some that seem to be for religious purposes (*inter alia* libations, described with the Aramaic version of a word also used in this context in PFT). The procedural relationship of the document (a simple list of commodities received) to the provision of the material in question to Bayasa is uncertain. (The fact that the names Vahya-ātar (46) and Artuki (49) also occur in A6, where Vahya-ātar is Akhvamazda's *pqyd* and Artuki the location of one of the houses Bagavant is supposed to be roofing, casts no light on the vexed question of the status of the *pqydn* in A6.9, since *inter alia* the Vahya-ātar of C1:46 appears as a recipient, not a provider.)
- In C3:44 the word *pšbr* = *\*pašyābara-* (cf. Elamite *baššabara*), interpreted as “provisions for the road”, occurs as one entry in a long list of provisions otherwise designated as for camel-drivers, servants, superintendents (*srkrn*), an official in charge of penalties, a scribe, the untitled Bagaicha -- and a divine gift for *fravartis*. The combination of secular and divine recalls C1, but there is no apparent overall link of the document as a whole to a particular journey. (Naveh & Shaked 2012, 36 speculate about a pilgrimage.)
- A2:1-2,3,6 refers to “*dwš'hr* of the wayfarers (*'rh'*) and the horses (*rkš'*)” or “necessities (*'pty'*) of the wayfarers and the horses” in the desert/steppe of Artadatana, though precisely what is being said about them is a little uncertain: one reading has soldiers collecting vinegar from the satrap's estate to form part of the stock of travel-provisions. “Wayfarers and horses” recalls the provision of (human) foodstuffs and fodder in Nakhtōr's document. (Neither *'rh'* nor *rkš'* is grammatically plural, which rather reinforces the sense that we are dealing with a bureaucratic designation – “the wayfarer-and-horse-provisions”.)

---

<sup>141</sup> Ps.-Them.*Epist.*20 is particularly resonant, with its record of a trip by land and river undertaken by Themistocles under the authorization of Artabanus with two horses, two *oiketai* and 13 other Persians in charge of *hodos* and *epitēdeia* (and travelling on camels). This item differs in character from the rest of the collection of pseudo-Themistoclean letters, and Lindsay Allen has wondered whether it might conceivably be particularly directly informed by an authentic documentary source, even if not necessarily one about Themistocles.

<sup>142</sup> Beersheba: Naveh 1973 and 1979. Makkedah: Ahituv 1999, Ahituv & Yardeni 2004, Epha'al & Naveh 1996, Lemaire 1996, 1999, 2002, 2006, 2007, Lozachmeur & Lemaire 1996, Porten & Yardeni 2003, 2004, 2006, 2007a, 2007b, 2008, 2009, 2012.

<sup>143</sup> From places such as Lachish, Tel es Hesi, Tel Jemmeh, Tel es-Serah Tel Farah, Tel 'Ira, Tel el-Kheleifeh and others, on which see Tuplin 1987, Bennet 1989, Hoglund 1992, 165-206, Edelman 2005, 281-331, Tal 2005, Betlyon 2005, Fantalkin & Tal 2006.

- C5:8 reads “there are men who found the rations on the roads (*b’rht*) and [they put (it?)] in a basket (*bgwn*)” (or perhaps “in our midst”). The earlier lines of the document seem to refer to wine, white (flour) and sheep rations, and they start with a reference to Vahyazaya who is also the person reported to have made the statement about “rations on the roads”. Is this a report that the wine, sheep and flour had been received during a journey – and, if so, from what sort of suppliers?
- D1-18 are tallies recording that someone has received something from an official source (and is thus in debt to that source) but the context of receipt is unknown (workers? soldiers? mobile? stationary?).
- A further document, reported by Shaked in Paris 2006 (but not included in Naveh & Shaked 2012) refers to someone being sent to the addressee and asks that he should receive food; there is reference to 2 *hophen* of white flour, 7 *hophen* of ordinary flour, 2 *hophen* of wine, 5 *hophen* of "covered" or "hidden" calf-meat (this is supposed to refer to animal kept in enclosure: there is an analogous term in the Persepolis records). The instruction is to “give him this food every day in full”. This sounds rather close to A6.9, making its non-publication particularly tantalizing.

### Geography<sup>144</sup>

Proper appreciation of the document depends on fixing the eight geographical reference points so far as possible. Two of them, Arbela (the fourth) and Damascus (the eighth) are of uncontroversial identity and location and require no further comment, save to observe that they are provincial centres as well as cities. Other names in the list evoke Assyrian provinces, as Dalley (forthcoming) emphasizes.

*/G[.]k<sup>d</sup>/r* The name is very poorly preserved. It ended *kr* or *kd* and there are pretty certainly just two other letters, the bottom left tip of the first being apparent next to the introductory *b* (= in), the entirety of the second being absent. (Driver reckoned three other letters besides *k<sup>d</sup>/r*, but we can discount that.) So, if Porten & Yardeni are right about the possibilities for the first missing letter (viz. aleph or gimel), we have four possibilities: *'xkd* (adopted by Lindenberger) or *'xkr* or *Gxkd* or *Gxkr*. There does not seem to have been much appetite for proposing identifications. The first of the four possibilities may momentarily evoke Akkad, but, although the idea is geographically appealing,<sup>145</sup> there is absolutely no reason to think *'Kkd* a plausible Aramaic rendering of the name.<sup>146</sup>

*L'r*, “La‘ir”. This plainly corresponds to Assyrian Lahiru (Driver, Dalley [forthcoming]), a term that denotes either a city or a region. The region in question was at the border between Elam and Babylonia east of the Tigris, and the city perhaps corresponded to the modern Eski Kifri (Parpola & Porter 2001, 12 with Map 10). The opening of a text from 678 BC (SAA 6.225) -- “seal of Idu‘a, town-manager (LUGAL-URU) of Lahiru of the domain of the Queen Mother, owner of the people sold”-- indicates that the queen mother, Naqia-Zakutu, owned an estate there. Nor is this the only sign of royal interest in Lahiru. Šamaš-šumu-ukin lived in Lahiru as crown prince (attested there in a deed concluded between the governor of Lahiru and Atar-ili, “eunuch of the crown prince of Babylon”, in April 670<sup>147</sup>); and two other legal documents (NALK 173-174) attest the purchase of land in Lahiru area by Milki-nuri, the

<sup>144</sup> This discussion is heavily informed by Dalley (forthcoming).

<sup>145</sup> It would entail that Nakhthor was travelling from Babylon rather than Susa; but that is no particular problem. The place appears in (early) Persian era documents, notably in the Cyrus Cylinder 1.31 (Schadig 2001, 553,556) but also e.g. YOS 3.45,81,106 (see Stolper 2003, 281-286), YOS 7.91, Cyr.267, Cyr.360, Stigers 1976, nos.26,33,36, CT 55.48,95, 57.100, VS 5.62/63,153,157, VS 6.169.

<sup>146</sup> One spelling cited in Driver 1965, 58 is *Kd'* (used of the land of Akkad), which is not propitious.

<sup>147</sup> ADD 625 = AR 116 (11 April 670), with Parpola 1970/1983 2.271. (The translation of *ša rēši* as “eunuch” is, of course, contentious. For the sceptical view see e.g. Dalley 2001, Pirngruber 2011.)

queen's eunuch, in 671 or 666 and in 668. The identity of the queen is uncertain in the first case (perhaps the mother of Šamaš-šumu-ukin, perhaps Libbali-šarrat, the wife of Ashurbanipal), but in the second it will certainly be Libbali-šarrat.<sup>148</sup>

Dalley (forthcoming) rightly draws attention to the estates held by Parysatis east of the Tigris in the same general area (which were looted by a Greek mercenary army in 401 BC: Xenophon *Anabasis* 2.4.27) and plausibly suggests that they reflect continuation of a tradition from Late Assyrian times. These villages (rich in corn and animals) were 6 (desert) stages (30 parasangs) north of the River Phycus and more or less immediately east of the river, and have been variously located (depending on differing views about "Opis") at the Little Zab/Tigris confluence (Masqueray 1931/49, 169), around Al Fathah (Manfredi 1985, 158f) in the vicinity of Kar-Issar or around Daur (Lendle 1995, 121), c.20 km. south of Tikrit (Tagritanu), in an area also later noted for sheep-rearing (Barnett 1963, 25). The region from the Adheim to the Little Zab can be associated in whole or part with Neo-Babylonian royal holdings and pastoralism (Joannès 1995, 194f), so royal villages and *probata* are well in place. Of course we are a fair way away from Lahiru; but the direct continuity from Assyrian royal estate to an estate in the hands of the Achaemenid prince Arshama is plainly a parallel phenomenon.

'*Rzwhn*, "Arzuḥin". Arzuḥin denotes both a city and a district. The city was perhaps at Goek Tepe (Parpola & Porter 2001, 6, with Map 10) on one of the upper branches of the Lower Zab river.

*Hl[.]Hl[.]* This has been variously read as *Hl'* (Driver 1954) and *Hlš* (Driver 1965, Grelot 1972). Neither is associable with relevant known names. In particular, as Dalley (forthcoming) points out, *Hlš* cannot properly be associated with the Assyrian province of Halzu. Dalley further observes that a reading of *Hlh* would fit with what is left of the name's third letter, yielding a reference to the province of Ḫalahḫu, lying to the northeast of Nineveh (for which cf. *RLA* s.v. Ḫalahḫu). This is surely correct.

*Mtlbš*, "Matalubash". This is often considered (e.g. by Driver, Oates 1968, 59-60, Kleber 2008, 206) to correspond to the town Ubase (Tell Huweish), on the west bank of the Tigris just north of Assur. The form Matalubash supposedly derives from a combination of Ubase with the two determinatives *mat*/land and *alu*/city – a phenomenon for which (as Dalley [forthcoming] notes) no parallel seems to exist.<sup>149</sup> An alternative proposed by Mario Fales is that MTLBŠ conceals Ma(t) Talbišu, in reference to a place on the Middle Euphrates, but there is no rational route from Ḫalahḫu to Talbiš and it strains credulity that a single *pqyd* could be responsible for an area embracing Arbela, Ḫalahḫu and Talbiš. But this misfit to reality is as nothing compared with Driver's idea, still noted in Grelot 1972, 311b as possible (though not preferable), that the third letter in *Hlx* might be *beyt*, giving Haleb, alias Aleppo – to which he added the proposition that MTLBŠ should be linked with Mardaböš, a town west of Homs. Whatever the merits of the latter idea (which appear scant), the former simply ignores the fact that *Hl[.]* denotes somewhere under the authority of a man who is certainly linked to Arbela.

The identification with Ubase is also accepted by Dalley (forthcoming), and may well be right. But another possibility is worth airing – one that echoes a feature of Mario Fales's suggestion but applies it elsewhere. Some 50 km. north of Nineveh (and a similar distance from Ḫalahḫu) was the Assyrian provincial capital Talmusa. Granted the potential for slippage between "b" and "m" – a phenomenon exemplified in the Middle Euphratan Talbišu which also appears as Talmišu – one might speculate that *Mtlbš* represents Ma(t) \*Talbusa.

<sup>148</sup> cf. Melville 1999, 15 and 62-63 with n.14.

<sup>149</sup> For *matu* as the term used from the ninth century onwards for the small units of the Assyrian kingdom as given in royal inscriptions, see e.g. Postgate 1985, 95-101. For combination of *mat* and a name cf. Mazamua (*mat* + *Zamua*).

This would be easier if the final letter in the Aramaic form were *samek* rather than *shin/sin* but the propitious location of Talmusa/\*Talbusa makes the suggestion rather tempting, and the combination of *mat* and \*Talbusa is more readily paralleled than the postulated *mat + alu + Ubase*.

*S'lm*, “Sa‘lam”. The reading is uncontroversial, but identification problematic. Driver noted Salamiyah, 45 km NE of Homs, but considered it to be too near Damascus. I am not sure that is a particularly cogent problem, but it is always going to be hard to convince people of a connection between Arshama’s estate and any particular example of this relatively common Arab place name, especially as Salamiyah would have to be regarded as a Semitizing substitute for an originally non-Semitic name.<sup>150</sup>

*General remarks* Dalley (forthcoming) observes that, in the light of the identifications suggested above, the estates of Arshama through which Nakhthor as his agent was expected to travel unimpeded, collecting rations from them, included land on both banks of the Tigris where the heartland of Assyrian power had once lain (Porten 1968, 54,71), and Nakhthor would have crossed the Tigris from the east bank to the west bank in the vicinity of Nineveh, reaching the crossing from the northeast rather than the southeast. The date of this journey, around the end of the fifth century, roughly a decade before Xenophon's visit in 401 BC, shows that Achaemenid rule was firmly established in Assyria, and that travel through the region was normal. The itinerary implies a degree of prosperity and security at odds with the impression of impoverishment created by Xenophon.

These observations prompt two further remarks. First, so far as Xenophon is concerned, the fact that there is no *pqyd* denominated in reference to Nineveh (or Mespila, to use Xenophon’s name) does mean that there is no evidence here *against* the suggestion that *that* city was in a poor state in 401 BC. That may sound convoluted; the positive point is that what creates an impression of impoverishment in this region (if anything does) is the description of Nimrud-Larisa and Nineveh-Mespila as deserted cities (*Anabasis* 3.4.7,10). Other indications are less gloomy. There are “many barbarians from neighbouring villages” available to take temporary refuge in Nimrud (3.4.9), and a day north of Nineveh the Greeks found themselves in a village so full of provisions that they spent a whole day there stocking up (3.4.18).<sup>151</sup>

Second, there is the question of itinerary. Dr Dalley’s formulation presumes that Nakhthor passed through all of Arbela, Ḥalahḥu and Ubase, so that his overall itinerary took him northwards, though Lahiru, Arzuhina and Arbela to Ḥalahḥu and then sharply back south to Ubase – after which he is presumably to be imagined going west to the lower Habur around Dur Katlimmu and then reaching Damascus either *via* Hindanu and Palmyra or *via* Hamat. But do we *have* to assume that? Might we not take the view that Upastabara’s three places define a region through which Nakhthor passes, just as (in fact) do the other *pqydn* with their single toponymical references? In one sense it makes little difference. Whether Nakhthor actually goes to Ubase or simply passes westwards out of a region whose western edge lies no further east than a line between Halahhu and Ubase, it remains the case that Salam, wherever it is, cannot reasonably be held to fill the entire gap between that point and

---

<sup>150</sup> The further hint in Driver’s note that SAA 13.19 (ABL 726) mentions a place called Salammê in the same context as Arbela is misleading. What we have is a personal name Arbailaiu; and there would in any case be the same problem with Salammê as with Salamiyah, viz. that there is nothing in the name to correspond to the *ayin* in the non-Semitic *S'lm*. (I thank Stephanie Dalley for her guidance on this point.) Note, incidentally, that Sa-la- in ABL 174 is now read as Sa-ba- in SAA 15.69.

<sup>151</sup> For fuller discussion of Xenophon’s representation of this region see Tuplin 2003. On Dur Sharrukin, which now becomes relevant as the principal city of Assyrian Ḥalahḥu, see Dalley (forthcoming).

Damascus. But, *if* we take the latter view (and in particular suppose that Nakht̥or does not necessarily go through Ubase itself), we are at liberty to imagine that his onward route after Upastabara’s “province” (the Arbela- Ḫalaḫḫu-Ubase triangle) simply took him along either the northern or southern route across Upper Mesopotamia towards Harran and the Euphrates crossing at Thapsacus. That would mean that he was essentially following a rather standard route from Susa or Babylon to the west, going up the eastern side of the Tigris, across the river around or north of Nineveh and then west along the road that led either to Anatolia or (in his case) Transeuphratene. On this way of looking at things the awkward sense of Nakht̥or zigzagging across the map can be eliminated. If, of course, *Mtlbš* actually were Talmusa, there would be no appearance of zigzag in the first place – which might be another consideration in favour of that identification.

### The nature of A6.9

There are three possible views of what sort of document A6.9 is. One is that it authorizes Nakht̥or to collect provisions from the personally-held estates of Arshama in various parts of Mesopotamia and the Levant (e.g. Lewis 1977, 6). A second, espoused by Whitehead (1974, 64) is that it authorizes Nakht̥or to collect provisions from the personally-held estates of *other* Persian grandees on the basis that they will be reimbursed from Arshama’s estate “through the central accounting system witnessed by the Elamite tablets” (sc. those in the Persepolis Fortification archive). A third is that it authorizes him to collect provisions from supply stations maintained by the state (Kuhrt 2007, 741). The choice is between a “private” model, in which the document belongs administratively speaking entirely within the realm of the management of Arshama’s estates (Lewis), and a “public” one, in which the document has traction within the administrative environment of the state’s collection and disbursement of foodstuffs, either indirectly (Whitehead) or directly (Kuhrt). The second model (and specifically the version expressed by Kuhrt<sup>152</sup>) is currently dominant. It may in the end be correct, but we need to be clear that it has weaknesses.

Arshama was a satrap, so he was certainly in principle entitled to issue documents of the sort that are designated in the Persepolis texts with the word *halmi* (literally “seal”, but understood to stand for “sealed document”). On the currently prevalent view (though not on Whitehead’s version of it) A6.9 is an example of such a *halmi*.

When reading Persepolis travel documents that end “PN was carrying a sealed-document of PN” one does not normally think about what that sealed-document said in detail. But the unspoken assumption is probably that it was rather curt: “PN orders that PN shall be entitled to take such-and-such a quantity of such-and-such a commodity per day from state resources”. With the appropriate seal attached that ought to be sufficient to work anywhere in the system (and not just in the Persepolitan region). The result would be that food was disbursed and a debit was recorded against the food-supply account – not against the royal estate *sensu stricto*, as that was something distinct (at least so current doctrine holds), but against the state’s estate.<sup>153</sup>

But Arshama’s document is not quite so curt or *prima facie* so generally applicable, since it has a number of specific addressees. Their status is indicated by the word *pqyd*, but we must acknowledge that that does not in itself establish beyond all dispute what sort of officials they are. (See A6.4:2 n.)

---

<sup>152</sup> Although Whitehead is often credited for promoting the case for the public model, his particular version is rarely addressed. I doubt that it has any distinctive advantages.

<sup>153</sup> On the general administrative system see especially Henkelman 2008, 126-161. For travel documents in particular see Henkelman (forthcoming).

The document has two fundamental characteristics. (a) The territories of the *pqydyn* do not exhaustively fill the space between Babylonia and Egypt (see above). (b) The instruction to provide food “from my estate”, taken at face value, indicates that Nakhthor is being fed from Arshama’s property and that the *pqydyn* are his estate-managers, whereas the association of the *pqydyn* with “provinces” (they are to give provisions “from my estate which is in your province(s)”) may seem to point towards the “public” organisation of imperial space and an identification of the *pqydyn* as state-officials (the “public” model). I am minded to think that insufficient attention has been paid to the first characteristic (geographical discontinuity) and that it has been too readily assumed that the conflict enshrined in the second characteristic can be resolved in favour of the public model.

One thing that is certain from discussion of the geography (see above) is that for the whole of the distance between the upper Tigris valley (whether the relevant most westerly point is Ubase or Talmusa) and the Egyptian border we have just two place names, Salam and Damascus. No conceivable understanding of Achaemenid imperial space can imagine the entirety of that space to be administratively filled by two provinces called or defined by Salam and Damascus. The *prima facie* conclusion is that Nakhthor cannot have been fed for the whole of his journey by the application of the order contained in A6.9 – and there are no good reasons to question this *prima facie* conclusion. It would not help to suppose (for example) that after Damascus Nakhthor went to the coast and completed the journey by sea: not only would this would not deal with the earlier gap in the itinerary, but it would require either that there was a second document authorising provisions for a sea-journey, or that the Damascus officials authorised the supply of provisions for (much) more than a single day. But we have no good reason to discard the belief that the instruction to provide rations “day by day” means what it says (see A6.9:3 n.). Nor does the reference to Egypt in A6.9:5 in any case assert (even implicitly) that the document is meant to cover every part of the trip (see n. ad loc.)

The fact that A6.9 cannot have kept Nakhthor and his companions fed throughout the whole of their journey has important implications. First, he must have had some other mechanism for securing provisions. Practically speaking, he and his companions either purchased food or disposed of another authorisation-document that worked in areas not covered by A6.9.<sup>154</sup> Second, whichever of those is the case, the “public” model explanation of A6.9 becomes problematic. The whole point about the supply-station system, as normally conceived, is that it applied systematically, at any rate along some well-defined long-distance routes. The geography is consistent with the assumption that Nakhthor was at all times following a route that was well-defined in the relevant sense. If he was in principle entitled to sustenance from the public system (that is, if Arshama was entitled to authorize him to draw from that system) and if A6.9 is the document that expresses that authorization, why is it not systematic?

The only possible conclusion is that, if Nakhthor did have a document authorizing him to draw on the public system, A6.9 is not that document. The situation must rather be that A6.9 is what it appears to be, an authorization to draw on Arshama’s estates where that was applicable, and that, for when it was not applicable, he carried either money or a document that had traction in public storehouses or both. The situation presumably reflects a judgement that, as an estate-manager, Nakhthor ought in the first instance to be supported by the estate and should only draw on other types of institutional resource when that primary option was not available.

---

<sup>154</sup> Whitehead envisaged that Nakhthor had more than one document, but limited the applicability of the second one to the stretch after Damascus. (It has to be said that Whitehead does not discuss the geography of the letter at all.)

Proponents of the public model have perhaps paid insufficient attention to the geographical problem. But they have not, of course, ignored the fact that Arshama orders provisions to be given “from my estate”. Their explanation is this: what Arshama says really means “give provisions from state resources on the understanding that the expenditure will be reimbursed from my estate”.<sup>155</sup> That is in principle a perfectly reasonable speculative gambit for those who feel compelled for other reasons to adopt the “public” model. But what degree of actual evidence is there for such a procedure?

The resource that is called in aid here is the Persepolis Fortification archive -- which is not surprising, because that is where we certainly find plenty of documents about the provisioning of travellers and an administrative environment in which the interplay of “public” and “private” is a matter of interest. But it is desirable to try to be as clear as possible about what the PFA can and cannot *prove* about A6.9.

The general sense of bureaucratic hyperactivity evinced by the PFA no doubt makes credit-debit arrangements seem reasonable in principle. Still, the actual record-keeping and accounting structure represented by the memoranda, journals and account-texts that form the archive is not performing that specific function. Indeed the suspicion has been expressed that the primary purpose of the processes that shape the archive is not to provide an informed basis for other bureaucratic procedures but simply to insist in a general (almost ideological) way upon the claims of central authority. It is true that attempts to explicate the procedures postulate information-collection that is now lost to sight, so anything may be possible. But the mere existence of the archive does not illustrate the “public” model for A6.9.

The question is whether, despite the archive’s primary concern with managing the resources of the public economy, one can find reflections of the sort of credit-debit process we are interested in. Can we spot Persepolitan equivalents of A6.9’s *pqydy*n (seen as state-officials) making payments on behalf of or recovering their pound of flesh from the equivalent of Arshama?

One can certainly detect the royal economy and points at which material passes between it and the main Persepolis economy, a process facilitated by the fact that Parnakka was probably in charge of both. But I do not find it easy to imagine that the King’s estate was required to reimburse the public economy: he was the king and, without prejudice to legalistic niceties about “ownership” of the empire, anything he took from the public economy was his due and anything he gave to it could be construed as regal beneficence.

Our interest must rather be in the activities of other estate-holders. Even that is not straightforward. Are the king’s wives in a different situation from the king? And, more pertinently, what about members of the extended royal family? Perhaps one should not beg questions by ruling out the idea that an Arshama might have to settle his debts.

Investigation of “private” estates in the PFA begins by looking for attestations of the three words that can be so translated – *ulhi* (royal-family estates), *irmatam* (the most common word), *appišdamana* (perhaps not “estate” at all). That is fairly easy and produces 51 documents about 45 different entities (mostly not immediately around Persepolis), associated with at least 28 different individuals. This would ideally be followed by an attempt to decide how much other estate-related activity is present in texts where the key words are not present. That would be a good deal more laborious, and is not attempted here. But inspection of directly attested estate activity reveals various things.

---

<sup>155</sup> Briant 2006, 350: when Arshama says provisions are to be given from his house “cela veut dire sans doute que le compte dont il dispose à titre de satrape, sur la ligne de budget “frais de mission”, sera débité ultérieurement, lorsque l’administration centrale fera le compte des entrées et de sorties (les *eisagogima* et *exagogima* du Pseudo-Aristote). En l’occurrence, la Maison d’Arshama n’a rien à voir avec une série de “domaines ruraux” privés ou, en tout cas, ne peut être réduite à cet aspect”.

1. *Ulhis* are held by the king, royal women and people (Karma, Ramunuya) of whom we can only say we do not know that they are not members of the royal family. Many other estate-holders are identifiable as persons of at least apportioner status. Speaking of *appišdamanas* Wouter Henkelman has wondered whether the people are estate-holders with administrative duties or stewards tending crown-estates. In the wider group of apportioner-status *irmatam*-holders (who include two people also associated with an *appišdamana*: Irtuppiya and Uštana) one inclines to the former view – indeed to the view that having an *irmatam* is a perk of being an official of that status. But it is conceivable that individuals had different relationships to *irmatams* and *appišdamanas*. Two estate-holders have titles, *habeziš*-person (PF 1256: a court-title) and *ansara* = “inspector”, a title that tends to appear in texts dealing with royal food supply (*huthut*) or having other royal connections.<sup>156</sup>

2. As to content, some texts are simply mystifying, e.g. PF 2071, a letter about an obscure dispute involving an estate, a palace and neglect of royal instructions.

3. Others mention estates as geographical reference points: Gobryas gets beer on a trip to “the estate of Karma” (PFNN 1133), Irtašduna and her son Iršama consume commodities at three different *appišdamanas* of Napumalika (PF 733-4, PF 2035), and in PF 1527 and PFNN 2157 people travel to the *appišdamana* of Irtuppiya. In the latter case they are gentlemen and servants whose purpose is unstated.<sup>157</sup> But in the former we have 1150 workers – so we might say that labour resources of the standard economy were being (temporarily?) deployed to work elsewhere. How they would be provisioned there, we do not know. In PFNN 1022 grain is received by “hemp-workers” at an *ulhi*-estate, and the grain seems to come from the normal economy. Two other texts report payments on royal authorisation to Teatukka the chamberlain and *karamaraš* at the *irmatam* of Bakabada the *habeziš* and to Kamezza and four *karamaraš* at the *appišdamana* of Uštana, who are “counting *taššup*” (people? officials? personnel?). If the recipients are coming to the estate to perform a task but then going away again, one might not categorize this as transfer of commodities from standard economy to estate economy. But Teatukka receives his ration for six months, so, if a visitor, he is a rather permanent one. Royal authorisation puts both cases into a slightly special category.

4. Various Irtašduna letters and one from Ramanuya order provisions from an *ulhi* for recipients who sometimes have titles (nurseryman; accountant; *tidda*-maker), sometimes not. The addressees are presumably estate-managers or the like (once they are accountants). These appear to be entirely internal to the *ulhi*-estate economy (and make one think of the *pqydyn* in the Bodleian letters).<sup>158</sup> There are no parallels in the case of *irmatams*. Rather we have Parnakka telling *irmatam*-holders to issue commodities. This does not prove that *irmatam*-holders did not have estate-managers or send them instructions. But such documents did not enter the archive, whereas ones from *ulhi*-holders did. Perhaps there is some structural reason for this.

5. We have a travel document (category Q) in which 300+ workers going to Tamukkan get a day’s rations at an unidentified estate. The supplier, Medamanuš, is otherwise unknown. The supplier-seal (PFS 95) is once associated with Ištimanka (a known estate-holder, but also a supplier and apportioner in the standard system) but normally with Umayya, who is certainly an agent of the standard economy in the Kamfiruz. Moreover, the estate is one at which the worker-chief Iršena the Anshanite apportions. He is a well-attested regional director within the

---

<sup>156</sup> The relevant text involves animals belonging to people at his estate that constitute tax (*baziš*) income.

<sup>157</sup> They appear elsewhere simply described as going to Irtuppiya, a reminder that texts do not always specify that a special type of location is in question.

<sup>158</sup> It should be noted that there are entirely parallel documents (in terms of addressor/addressee) that do not happen to mention the *ulhi* as such.

main economic system; and Ištīmanka (just mentioned) regularly turns up as a commodity supplier using the same regional seal as Iršena. So, all things considered, this estate seems rather well-embedded in the main economy – perhaps unusually so, which is why it generates this unique text. The phenomenon – a normal process, here travel rations, exceptionally located at and drawing on an estate – recurs. We get it for example with a single category F and a single category G text (respectively setting grain aside for seed and providing commodities for provisions) that, exceptionally, are located at an *irmatam* rather than a simple toponym. But the implied movement of material between estate- and standard economy can be seen elsewhere. There are category C1 texts where “use” or “deposit” at an estate replaces more normal apportioning or deposit at simple place-names. In PFNN 0290 animals are sent to Irtuppiya’s estate.<sup>159</sup> PFNN 2369 lists various people sending grain from various places (or individuals), to a total of over 300,000 quarts and then says: “flour *pirdubakaš* [meaning unknown] *irmatam tinkeka*” = “sent to the estate”.<sup>160</sup> The hemp-workers mentioned above belong here too, perhaps. In the other direction Parnaka orders Ištīmanka to supply grain from his estate for religious use at Kaupirriš and the feeding of Babylonian workers cutting wood on a local mountain – men operating in an unusual location, whose immediate source of supply is most conveniently a non-standard one, so one might guess. PF 2079 (category W) lists fruit coming into the normal economy from various places,<sup>161</sup> including an estate, PF 1898 reports wine acquired by a delivery-man from the estate of Marriya, PFNN 2271 records that a huge quantity of grain from the *irmatam* of Masdayašna was used at Persepolis, and grain from Naktanna’s estate (perhaps grain tax) is an income stream in an Akkuban account (PF 2075)

6. And then there is the case of Ukama. Six time Ukama and *taššup* (personnel) receive substantial amounts of flour, wine or fruit at five or more different estates. The only close parallel for such a group (Karkiš and *taššup*) receiving commodities occurs at a *hapidanuš* (= water-reservoir?) The norm is for a named person to receive commodities at a toponym. So, what seem to be commodities belonging to the standard economy are being received by unusual groups (they may be soldiers: cf. Tuplin [forthcoming (a)]) at unusual places. But are the commodities going into the estate-economy or is the estate *simply* a geographical location? The case is complicated by Ukama’s appearance in PF 1857 as author of a letter to Parnakka about an inventory of grain stored at a fortress in which there is reference to quantities of grain at seven sites, of which four are explicitly estates and a fifth is known to be an estate of Queen Irtašduna. So we have a series of estate-holders who have to account for some grain from their holdings to the Persepolis bureaucracy. Specifically the information is about the amount of grain provided per unit set aside for seed; and that makes a link with PFNN 0001, where two tables of figures give similar information and each is followed by: “this is the total (at) the estate of PN (of the) unirrigated grain (that was) provided for provisions”. Moreover right at the end of this document we find: document/clay-tablet (about) unirrigated (grain) 60 of grain was provided by/for the *taššup*”. The maths is hard to follow, but the recurrence of *taššup* takes us back to Ukama and his *taššup*. What is going on here remains obscure. Are we to imagine some special obligation on estates to support the military?

Well, perhaps not: but it is clear that estates interacted with the general economy sufficiently to have some impact on the archive’s records, and that the quantities of material

<sup>159</sup> The person sending them is otherwise unknown; and wherever animals are involved we are arguably in a special corner of the economic forest (even one with royal overtones)

<sup>160</sup> Hinz/Koch have “sent *from* the estate”, but it does not *say* that.

<sup>161</sup> One of the others is Marriya the *marduš* [Weinbereiter] of PN. In the light of NN-0522, mentioning Bakabaduš, *marduš* at the estate of PN, one may wonder if Marriya represents another estate. That makes for an odd coincidence with 1898 (above) from four years earlier, but the two Marriyas are probably different. (The one in 1898 is additionally labelled “of the Pururu and Kukazi people”.)

involved were sometimes quite considerable. What remains absent is any direct sign that the cross-transfers are supposed to be a zero-sum game or that any particular transfers are retrospective reimbursements of earlier *ad hoc* transfers rather than the current or prospective execution of standard obligations (e.g. tax) or momentary planning. When we (think we) see an estate-owner providing for an estate-subordinate it is in documents that lie entirely in the estate setting and perhaps only turn up in the archive because they have a royal allure and Parnakka's dual role in royal and standard economic systems made for archival cross-contamination. Of course, once one goes beyond documents explicitly about estates, one sees plenty of "economic activity" (work being done by workers) that is under the aegis of royal women and that passes through the archive in the shape of regular worker-rations. Those rations are on the face of it supplied by the standard system just like the rations of all sorts of other workers. It is a perk of royalty that that is what happens, just as it is a perk of royalty or elite status that the Table of the King, of the Queens and of a Carmanian satrap who happens to be in the Persepolis region is (partly) provided for by the standard system.

So, is there no sign of credit-debit? In fact, two hints do appear in Wouter Henkelman's discussion of the provisioning of kings, queens and satraps (Henkelman 2010).

1. In Fort.3544 Miturna, the "*mardam* of Karkiš," transports wine to Parnuttiš as *ukpiyataš* of/for the king. The *mardam* is an agent of Karkiš's estate (Karkiš being the Carmanian satrap); the wine supplier Ušaya is an agent of the Persepolis system; *ukpiyataš* is an income stream for the royal food supply. So the argument is that Karkiš owes an *ukpiyataš*-tax on his estate, pays it with wine from the standard system – and is presumably expected eventually to pay it back. If that is correct it presumably also applies to the transaction in PF 48, where the *mardam* of Nariyapikna (a man otherwise known as an apportioner) takes wine to Parnamattiš for *ukpiyataš*.

2. The possibility of credit is also raised in relation to the texts about the entertainment of Irtašduna and Iršama at the *appišdamana* of Napumilka (PF 733-734, PF 2035) and to two further ones just about Irtašduna (PF 732, PF 0454). A distinctive feature here is the unusual appearance of the verb *terika* in documents otherwise conforming to a standard pattern for supply of commodities for the Queen's Table. The suggestion is that *terika* means "loaned" and that Irtašduna is borrowing resources from outside her own domains – resources that she will have to pay back.

If these *are* signs of credit-debit transactions, they are a meagre haul; and only the first involves the interaction of private estate and public economy.

To return to Nakhtḥor and A6.9, the essential point is this. Those who go for the "public" model are entitled to speculate about a mechanism for reimbursement of the state from Arshama's private resources. But it is only speculation; and arguably it is speculation prompted by a reading of the situation that is contentious for other reasons. Of course, there remains the question of why Arshama uses the term "province". But this is not so difficult. The usage is not in principle very different from the references elsewhere to *pqydy*n in Lower Egypt. I do not claim that "Lower Egypt" is the name of an official province; on the contrary it may have consisted of more than one province. But that means that in the right circumstances (and when needing a bit more precision) one might quite reasonably refer to "so-and-so the *pqyd* in Thebes". The bottom line is that, if people saw the imperial space as made up of a series of provinces, then those are terms of reference that can be used even when one is not talking about structures of government.

line 1 *mn* 'rsm, "from Arshama". Given Nakhtḥor's direction of travel, it is natural to assume that Arshama was in Elam or Mesopotamia when the letter was written. The Persepolis documentation does reveal cases of people travelling *towards* the (presumed) location of the

person whose travel authorization (*halmi*) they carry (so-called “reverse authorizations”).<sup>162</sup> But we do not know that the documents they carried were formulated like A6.9: that is, we do not know that, when someone travelled away from his authorizing official and then back again, he carried a different *halmi* on the return trip, one formulated as though written at the intermediate destination. (This is just one aspect of the larger fact that we do not *know* how A6.9 sits in relation to the processes seen in the Fortification archive: see above.) The inclination to make the natural assumption about Arshama’s whereabouts when A6.9 was written is probably fuelled by a feeling that an Egyptian estate *pqyd* would be unlikely to be in Mesopotamia or Elam at a time at which his master Arshama was somewhere else (particularly if that somewhere else were Egypt). But perhaps that feeling begs questions.

line 1 *pqyd*, “official”. Lindenberger also translates the word as “official” (not “steward”) here. On their function/status see A6.4:2 n.

lines 1-2 *Mrdk...Hw[md]t*, “Marduk... Hau[mada]ta”. Two of the officials (those closest to Babylonia) have Babylonian names. One is uncertain (*Hw[...]t* at Damascus<sup>163</sup>) but can be restored as Persian (*Hw[md]t* = \*Haumadāta, a name attested in Aramaic and Elamite at Persepolis: Tavernier 2007, 198). The rest are uncomplicatedly Persian: see Tavernier 2007, 68 (\*Zātavahyā), 134 (\*Bagafarnā), 180 (\*Frādafarnā), 331 (\*Upastābara-).

lines 1-2 *G[.]kr...Dmšk*, “[...]... Damascus”. On the identity and location of these places see above.

line 2 *h’*, “behold”. The only occurrence of this word among Bodleian letters written by Arshama, though it is also used once each of Varuvahya (A6.14:4) and Virafsha (A6.15:3). In ADAB it appears just once (B1), again not in a letter from the satrap. Neither corpus uses *hlw*, a word of similar meaning. Elsewhere seven of the other letters in TADAE use *h’* (A3.1, A4.2, A4.4, D7.15, D7.16, D7.27, D7.44) and fifteen use *hlw* (A2.2, A2.3, A2.6, D1.20, D7.1, D7.2, D7.4, D7.5, D7.8, D7.17, D7.20, D7.24-25, D7.44, D7.52). The level of use (and proportions between the two words) are comparable in the CG ostraca (*h’*: 10, *hlw*: 27). In contract documents *h’* (but never *hlw*) regularly marks the statements of the boundaries (B2.2, B2.7, B2.10, B3.4, B3.10, B3.12) or measurements (B3.5) of a house, but only appears rarely in other contexts (B2.11, B5.6). In short, these are words proper to relatively informal letter-writing (with *hlw* the preferred form). That the one occurrence among Arshama’s own letters occurs in the formally distinctive open letter may be significant. In any event, the exceptionality of the usage perhaps affords Lindenberger some justification for turning “And now, behold, he whose name is Nakht̥or, my official...” into “This is to introduce my official, Nakht̥or by name.”

<sup>162</sup> Some apparent cases of reverse authorization might arise because the authorizing official was temporarily not in his usual location. (If the Fortification archive covered the second half of the fifth century and contained a document in which someone went to Egypt carrying a *halmi* of Arshama there would be a tendency to regard this as a reverse authorization; but we know that that need not be so.) But we cannot eliminate the category entirely.

<sup>163</sup> Driver read this as *Gwz’n* (putatively Babylonian Guzanu or Iranian \*Gavazāna- or \*Gauzāna-), Grelot as *Gwzyn*, putatively Iranian \*Gawzīna/Gawzaina or \*Gawzāyana- (1972, 472,507). Tavernier 2007, 189 postulates \*Gauzaina- or \*Gauzēna-, additionally attested by Elamite Kamšena (PFNN 1277:3). But all this is beside the point if Porten-Yardeni’s new reading is accepted.

line 2 *Nḥthwr*, “Nakhthor”. Egyptian Nḥt+Ḥr, “strong is Horus (DN 654). The name is not certainly attested in Egyptian Aramaic outside the Bodleian Arshama letters, though it might appear at Saqqara 105:4.

line 2 *šmh*, “whose name is”. See 6.3:1 n.

line 2 *'zl Mšryn*, “is going to Egypt”. Failure to specify a purpose of the journey is also characteristic of Persepolis travel documents. (Incidentally, PF 1544 seems to be the only Persepolis document about a trip to Egypt, one undertaken by Uštana and a companion in 499/8.) Since we know that *pqydn* could travel to Babylon to take rent (A6.13), we cannot assume that Nakhthor’s trip here is on the occasion of his original appointment as *pqyd*. Another journey by an Egyptian estate-manager to the heart of empire may be reflected by the presence on an Aramaic document (unfortunately illegible) in the Fortification archive of the impression of a scarab(oid) seal inscribed “chief of Pe and overseer of (royal) mansions” (PFATS 424: Garrison & Ritner 2010).<sup>164</sup>

line 2 *ptp*, “rations”. Iranian *\*piθfa-*, “ration” (Tavernier 2007, 410). The word, also used in the Arshama correspondence in A6.12 of the rations given to Ḥinzani and his household (see note there), appears in various other places in Achaemenid-era texts, consistently referring to rations-in-kind, though not normally in a travel context. (ADAB C5:8 is an exception.) *Egypt (Elephantine)*: B3.13, B5.5, C3.14:38,51 (all referring to rations for the Syene or Elephantine garrison – including their womenfolk – which are sometimes described as coming from the royal storehouse) and D3.12 (isolated word on a tiny papyrus fragment). Grelot restored the word in B4.4:5 as well, though Porten-Yardeni do not do so. (The text is clearly related to ration procedures.) *Idumaea*: EN 201, an early fifth century text, not part of the main Makkedah archive, in which some individuals with Hebrew or Edomite names are said to be going to give *ptp* to the Egyptian-named servants (*'lymy*) of [...]. *Persepolis*: PF 858, 1587, 2059 (in Aramaic annotations on Elamite tablets) and PFAT *saepe*. The superscription on PFS 66 (one of only three elite seals used for disbursement of commodities consumed at court: Henkelman 2010, 689-692) may refer to a *\*piθfakāna* named *\*Farnadāta-* (information from Mark Garrison).<sup>165</sup> The title perhaps describes the function of officials whom the Elamite texts mark with the word *kurmin* (“allocation of...”) *Bactria*: ADAB B2:2 (here written *ptw'*, which is closer to an original *\*piθva-*), C4:10,42, C5:8. A *\*piθfakāna* appears in Bactria as well (C1:47, C4:10). For a different office-title derived from *\*piθfa-* (*\*piθfabaga-*) see A6.12:1 n.

line 2 *bmdyntkm*, “in your provinces”. Outside of A6.9 *mdynh* (in Aramaic or Hebrew) designates the generality of imperial provinces in Ezra 4.15, Dan.3.2,3 and Esther (*passim*: there are 127 of them [1.1], so they are smaller than satrapies) and is applied more specifically to Thebes (A4.2, C3.14, D3.19), Tshetres (A4.5, C3.14; and A5.2, B3.13, D1.26, D4.17 are also likely to be Tshetres, given the provenance of the documents), Pamunpara (A6.1<sup>166</sup>), Samaria (WDSP 4 and 5), Judah (Ezra 2.1, 5.8, Neh.1.3, 7.6), Babylon (Ezra 7.16,

---

<sup>164</sup> The title is separately attested during the first Persian domination: Vercoutter 1962, 105-108. The seal is one of six Fortification archive seals with hieroglyphic inscriptions. For some unprovenanced Egypto-Persian seals cf. Giovino 2006. The wider phenomenon of the Egyptian personal or artefactual presence in Persis is surveyed in Wasmuth 2010.

<sup>165</sup> PFS 66 is distinctively associated with flour, so Henkelman 2010, 690 assigned the seal specifically to the official responsible for milling the royal grain.

<sup>166</sup> The reading is uncertain. (Other possibilities are apparently Pasunpara, Nasunpara or Namunpara.) If correct, it might designate somewhere in the eastern Delta (see commentary on A6.1, in Ma &

Dan.2.48-49, 3.1,12,20), Elam (Dan.8.2), Media (Ezra 6.2) and Nikhshapaya (ADAB A4). These are characteristically relatively or very large tracts of land.<sup>167</sup> The exception is Nikhshapaya which, since it is having a wall and ditch built around it, is evidently a town/city. This could also be true of the plural *mdynt'* in ADAB B8:2 (the letter is too fragmentary to assess).<sup>168</sup> But the unidentifiable allusions in three Saqqara documents (D3.30, Saqqara 103, Lemaire & Chauveau 2008 fr.[a]) -- in the last of which the name seems to start with the letters PMB -- are presumably to a province or provinces in Egypt comparable to Tshetres, Thebes and Pamunpara. Given the provenance of the documents we may be dealing *inter alia* with the province (whatever it was called) which included Memphis. The relationship between these Egyptian provinces and the traditional and nomes or districts<sup>169</sup> is a moot point: the man in charge of a province (at least in Tshetres) was an Iranian (with an Iranian title, *frataraka*), so they are not *simply* identical, and it is possible that the Persians had imposed a new structure upon top of the (admittedly historically shifting) nomes. At least some of the “provinces” in A6.9, by contrast, give the appearance of being closely descended from Assyrian provinces (see below). On the problem of the relationship between the *pqydy* addressed in this letter and the provinces with which they are associated see the note on line 1 above. The official titles with which provinces are otherwise linked in documentary sources are *phh* or *frataraka* (at governor level)<sup>170</sup> and judges, scribes, *tpty'* and *gwšky'* (at lower levels within the hierarchy).<sup>171</sup>

line 3: *ywm lywm*, “day by day”: The instruction to provide rations “day by day” and the more specific instruction that if the travellers are in one place for more than one day they are not to get further rations encourage one to believe that the travellers are only given one day’s ration at a time and have to keep moving. Any other view would entail a procedural environment in which the way a letter like this worked was understood by all involved to allow for the possibility that travellers *might* sometimes be given provisions for several days, on the basis that they could not claim further provisions until they had completed the appropriate number

---

Tuplin (forthcoming)). It is perhaps a little disconcerting that an Achaemenid era province name should be so elusive.

<sup>167</sup> The word’s application to very large areas (Media, Babylon, Elam) in some Biblical texts conflicts with the 127 provinces in Esther 1.1 and elsewhere. One cannot establish whether it might have occurred in Achaemenid era documents.

<sup>168</sup> Association of the word with a town or city has analogues in various much later Palmyrene items cited in Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995.

<sup>169</sup> Attested in Achaemenid era documents in CG 50060, Pap. Meerman-Westreeianum 44, Bothmer no.66 (chiefs); S.H5–DP 434 [2355] = published in Smith & Martin 2010, 31-39 (no.4) (scribes); CG 33174 (scribes and judges); P.Berlin 13552 (the *tš* of Osorwer); P.Louvre 9292, P.Loeb 41, P.Turin Cat.2127 (references to “Calasirians [soldiers] of the *tš*”). The word *tš* forms part of the traditional term Tshetres (“district of the south”) which becomes a province (*mdynh*) name in the Persian dispensation. More confusingly Egyptologists sometimes translate *tš* as “nome”, sometimes as “district”.

<sup>170</sup> *Frataraka*: see above. (The term had a different reference in Bactria: see Tuplin [forthcoming (b)].) *Phh*: this is the title of governors of Samaria (A4.7:29 // A4.8:28; WDSP 7.17,8.10; WD 22) and Judah (A4.7:1 // A4.8:1, stamp impressions [Vanderhooft & Lipschits 2007], *bullae* [Avigad 1974, nos. 5 and 14]). Compare also the *phwt* of provinces in general in *Esther* 3.12, 8.9, 93, *Dan*.3.2. These passages (plus *Esther* 1.3) also offer *sgny*, *šare* and even “satraps” as high-level “province” officials, which one might (but perhaps optimistically) regard as evidence that *mdynh* is consciously a generic term embracing different categories of administrative region. The suggestion in Smith 1990, 296 that Saqqara S.H5-DP450 contains a reference to a “satrap of the south” has entirely disappeared in the definitive publication of that text in Smith & Martin 2010.

<sup>171</sup> See A4.5:9, A6.1:1,6. *Dan*.3.2-3 (“the *'drgzry'* (?), treasurers [*gdbry'*], judges [*dtbry'*], *tpty'*, and all the rulers [*šltny'*] of the provinces”) might also be mentioned here.

of days' travel. That is tantamount to saying that everyone knew that a letter like A6.9 did not mean what it said. But there is little reason for us to say any such thing. It is true that the primary concern of A6.9 is to ensure that the travellers keep moving. But the postulated "understanding" could thwart this, because it would make it possible for the travellers to stockpile provisions.<sup>172</sup> The suggestion can only be entertained if there were parts of the journey where it was *known* that travellers had to go for, say, three days before they would come to the next provision point. The validity of that idea in the present context intersects with questions about the geography. But we can be sure that the space from Damascus to Egypt was not devoid of potential supply points, so multiple provisioning will not help explain why *pqydy*n in Damascus are the last addressees of Arshama's letter, and we should have to be very sure about the existence of potential sections of poor provision earlier in the route to feel that this is an idea worth pursuing. In short, we should not entertain the idea that A6.9 authorizes anything but daily collection of a single day's rations – certainly not unless and until other considerations leave no other option. In the Persepolis system travellers normally got food a day at a time because the Persepolis-Susa road plainly had daily provisioning points. (Note also the reference to "every day" in the still unpublished new Bactrian document mentioned above.) We should not *start* by assuming that the route Nakhthor followed was not like that.

lines 3-4, *qmh h̄wry .... rkšh*, "white flour...horses". How do the figures here compare with the Persepolitan travel texts? The failure to specify an amount for the horses contrasts with the occasional appearance of specific amounts of grain (or even flour) allocated to horses, mules, camels – and even in one case dogs (PFNN 0317). The amounts vary -- and vary within single documents: some horses in a party get more than others -- and may represent a variably partial contribution to the animals' sustenance. The vagueness in the Nakhthor document (which unlike the Persepolis documents *precedes* the moment of allocation) may be to allow for various local conditions and the availability of grazing. But when we turn to the human consumers things are clearer.

Since 1 *hophen* = 1 QA = 0.97 litres (see below, note on line 3), in Persepolitan terms Nakhthor is getting 5 QA of flour (even if of different grades) and 2 QA of wine / beer, while his servants are getting 1 QA. Their ration is entirely normal; but Nakhthor's certainly is not. If one leaves aside occasional cases in which an individual is given a very large allocation because he is responsible for the subsistence of significant numbers of subordinates who are not registered in their own right in the official record – cases that are not parallel to Nakhthor because in his case we *are* told about his fellow-travellers – his daily flour rate is only comparable with perhaps three cases. Most exact is PFNN 0663 – Kampizza the Anshanite travelling Susa-Persepolis on royal authorisation with 51 companions in the fifth month of an unknown year gets 5 QA. Straddling the target are (a) PFNN 1859 which records a group of Indians, one of whom gets 12 QA (while the other 100 get the basic 1 QA), and (b) PFNN 2569 in which Titrakeš travelling on royal authorisation with 80 men, 30 horses and 88 mules in 494 BC gets 4 QA. Even if the 5 mixed-grade QA of flour were equivalent to only 3 Persepolitan QA, that adds only three more cases: (a) PFNN 0431 Zakurra the Gandarian, travelling with 190 companions, 12 camels and 31 mules from Gandara to Susa ( early 501 BC); (b) PFNN 2047 Harmišda travelling with 160 companions in 494; and (c) PFNN 1944 Daukka, travelling from Susa in 500/499 BC (no companions mentioned).

Turning to wine and beer, the ration here is usually 1 QA or less. There are two other cases of a ration of 2 QA of beer (PFNN 2557, PFNN 2634) and up to eight with figures higher

---

<sup>172</sup> When travellers arrive somewhere and demands a day's provisions as *per* the letter, how is the supplier to know if they picked up three days' provisions at the previous supply-point?

than that;<sup>173</sup> and there are 5 cases of a 2-QA wine ration and only two cases of a higher one.<sup>174</sup> Some of the people involved are connected with Indians; others have titles that may mark them as of importance – Aššašturrana “the quiver-carrier” (PF 1560) or Hašina, the *dattimaraš* of the lanceman (PFNN 0937).<sup>175</sup> So: Nakhtḥor is doing fairly well for alcoholic drink, even if not quite as well proportionately as in his flour allocation. By way of further context it is worth noting that there are far more records for travellers receiving flour than for those receiving wine/beer. That *might* just be a quirk of documentary survival, but is much more likely to be because only a minority of travellers were allocated alcoholic drink in the first place; that is in line with the fact that Nakhtḥor’s servants get no drink and it means we should not underestimate the status-significance of Nakhtḥor’s two daily quarts. Taken together with his 5 QA of flour they signal that, as the *pqyd* of a *br byt’*, he lives rather well – provided he does what he is told (line 6) and keeps moving.

line 3 *hwry*, “‘white’”. This evidently designates white flour (for *hwry* = white see also Daniel 7.9, “white as snow”). In the Bactrian documents the term is used of oil (C1:25) as well as flour (B4:6, C1:15,34,38,40,42,44,47,50, C5:5; and the new document mentioned above). (The reference in A9:5, D2:2 is rather unclear.) Could this word possibly be cognate with *hr* = noble? If that were feasible, it would resonate with the suggestion that a term used for *tarmu*-grain (i.e. emmer) in PFT, viz. *hadatiš*, is derived from \**azāta*- = “noble”: Henkelman 2010, 753 n.313. (*Hwry* is not otherwise recorded in Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995; there is also nothing salient in Sokoloff 2002.)

What sort of cereal the flour Nakhtḥor and his companions got was made from is unstated. At Persepolis we encounter what are also the three most common cereal crops in Mesopotamia, viz. barley (ŠE.BAR) and two types of wheat, emmer (*tarmu*) and (much less commonly) bread-wheat or durum (ŠE.GIG) (Henkelman 2010, 750-753), and barley and wheat were also dominant in Palestine (judging at least by the Bible, where wheat is the more highly valued commodity), whereas the Bactrian documents speak of barley (*š’r*), wheat (*hntḥ*) and millet (*dhn*), millet being given to servants and lower-status people (ADAB C4:14,21,26,28) – though not always (C4:43) – and wheat being given to nobody (making one wonder whether its appearance in the listing of “barley, wheat and millet” in B6:8, C4:4 may be somewhat formulaic: so Naveh & Shaked 2012, 34). At Syene-Elephantine the garrison-troops receive rations in barley (C3.14 *passim*)<sup>176</sup> or emmer (B3.13, B3.14:7,16<sup>177</sup>). (I am not sure that the adjacent references to wheat and the *prs* of Jedoniah in CG 170 guarantee that his ration was ever in wheat.) Herodotus (2.36, cf. 77) contrasts those who live on wheat (*puroi*) and barley (*krithai*) with Egyptians living on *olura* (“which some call *zeiai*”) -- which must be emmer. (The Egyptian word is *bdt*, and it was the chief crop between dynasties XXII and XXVI:

<sup>173</sup> PFNN 0372 (3 QA), PF 1529, PFNN 2634 (4 QA), PF 1529, 1546, PFNN 2634, PFNN 2637 (10 QA), 1525 (20 QA). The last of these might be a quantity intended to be shared with others, as I assume is the case with the 356 QA for Aktama in PFNN 0716 and the 70 QA for Datis in PFNN 1809 (cf. Lewis 1980). In PFNN 2637 rather remarkably we have a group of 114 individuals each receiving 10 QA.

<sup>174</sup> 2 QA: PF 1552, 1559, 1560, 1562, PFNN 0622 (in the last case the *prima facie* figure of 1.905 must be an error for 2). Higher are PFNN 0937 (6 QA) and PF 1563-1564 (10 QA).

<sup>175</sup> On “lancemen” cf. Henkelman 2002. I hope to discuss them elsewhere in the context of the search for soldiers in the Persepolis Fortification archive.

<sup>176</sup> B4.3, B4.4 may also be indirectly relevant. One name for the royal storehouse at Elephantine was *ywdn* = \**yaudāna*- or *yavadāna*- (A4.5:5), which some regard as meaning specifically “barley-house” (Porten-Yardeni; cf. Naveh & Shaked 2012, 207,209 in reference to other words with the root *yava*-).

<sup>177</sup> In these two lines *š* (for *š’r*) at the start of a line which refers to a barley disbursement has been erased and replaced with *k* (for *knt*).

Lloyd 1975-88, 2.154-155) This sharp contrast between Egypt and the rest of the world breaks down where the Aramaic evidence is concerned, since both wheat (albeit rarely<sup>178</sup>) and barley (rather frequently<sup>179</sup>) are in evidence, as well as emmer.<sup>180</sup> But since so much of the relevant material relates to the Jewish community at Elephantine, that is perhaps not entirely surprising. C3.26 does (neatly in terms of Herodotus' claim) record the disbursement of emmer to people with mostly Egyptian names (there are just a couple of Aramaeans and one Persian), and, although there are Egyptian-named members in the Syene garrison *barley* disbursement list (C3.14), an Egyptian name does not *prove* Egyptian origin: compare the *Aramaean* Pakhnum son of Besa, who lent emmer to Anani b. Haggai (B3.13), a loan that would be repaid from his official ration. But that transaction shows that emmer might enter the official food-chain, irrespective of ethnicity, and the truth must be that both grains circulated at the first cataract, and it would be surprising if Egyptians did not sometimes consume barley. See also Porten 1968, 80-84.

line 3 *hpn*, “measures”. The *hophen* (literally “handful”; rendered “measure” by Driver and “cup” by Lindenberger) occurs regularly in other Egyptian Aramaic documents (to the list in Porten & Lund 2002 s.v. add Saqqara 41, 68, 77a, 126, CG 58, 160, 219, 229 X16) and in the Bactrian letters (to the documents in Naveh & Shaked 2012 add the unpublished document mentioned above), along with other units (1 *gwn* = 10 *'rdb* = 30 *gryw* or *s'h* = 300 *hpn*) not represented in the present letter.<sup>181</sup> It is properly a dry measure but its application to liquid goods in the present passage is paralleled in Bactria (e.g. ADAB C1:25, C3:41,45 [variously wine or vinegar]) and Egypt (A2.2:13, A2.4:12, B2.6:15, B3.3:5-6, B3.8:20-21, D3.16:8-9 [all oil], CG 58 [commodity uncertain]). The occurrence of the *artaba* both in Egypt and at Persepolis allows one to work out that 1 *hophen* = 1 QA = 0.97 litres (Porten 1968, 71)<sup>182</sup> and therefore to assess Nakhthor's rations by comparison with the levels found in the imperial heartland. See above. It appears that the Bactrian documents almost never allow one to calculate individual daily rations, though an official (in charge of punishments) seems to get 1 *hophen* of wine in ADAB C3:41. At Elephantine Porten 1968, 81 claims 1.5 ardabs = 45 QA is a standard barley ration, even though it is the one received by fewest people in the list in C3.14. The other ration levels are 30 QA and 75 QA. His figures for wheat would be 20, 30 and 50, the standard ration being therefore 1 *artaba* = 30 QA.

line 3 *rm/dmy*, “inferior (?)”. The word appears several times in the Bactrian documents (ADAB B2:2, C1:16,35,48, C3:21,22,38), and may also occur (sometimes as *rm*) in CG 1:3,

<sup>178</sup> B4.1 (in a formulaic list; other such lists [B3.1:10, B4.6] mention just barley and emmer), CG 93,150,170,215, D4.4:3, D7.39. (Both CG 93 and D7.39 also mention Pherendates – perhaps the early fifth century satrap?) Two further texts, C3.28, D8.11, are of Ptolemaic date.

<sup>179</sup> Barley is the most copiously attested food stuff in the CG ostraca (Lozmacheur 2006, 89): CG 2, 14, 15, 22, 24, 25, 41, 46, 49, 52, 66, 93, 120, 122, 132, 144, 150, 152 (= D7.16), 155, 204, 212, 232, 263, J2. See also Saqqara 85, A2.4, A4.4, A4.10:14 (the Jews' bribe to Arshama), B4.3, B7.1, C3.13:34-43, C3.14, C3.16-17, D1.20, D1.33, D2.11, D2.27, D7.12, D7.39, D7.45, D7.50.

<sup>180</sup> B3.13, C3.8IIIB, C3.14, C3.16, C3.17, C3.18, C3.25, C3.26, D3.1, D6.8(fr.c) (the putative companion letter to A6.11), CG 42. The reading is uncertain or of uncertain interpretation (there can be confusion with the Aramaic word for “colleagues”) in CG 20, 91, 121bis, 213.

<sup>181</sup> The word is cognate with Akkadian *upnu*, “hollow of the hand; handful”. The phrase *pūt upni* designates a (rather special?) type of cup (cf. CAD 12.545-546).

<sup>182</sup> Admittedly some might wish to qualify this blunt statement, given the uncertainties surrounding the *artaba* (see A6.11:2 n.) and Grelot's espousal of a distinct liquid *hophen* of 0.33 litres (1964, 64; 1970, 124: this is the value assigned by Erman to the Egyptian *d3*), apparently – but the note is not entirely clear – abandoned at 1972,311-312 (note *h*).

10:1, 189:1 (though not in circumstances that can cast much independent light). There are two problems: how to read it (*rmy* or *dmy*), and what meaning to give to each of the possible readings.

*Rmy* has been variously understood as “inferior” (Driver [adducing Targum-Aramaic *ramyah* = “rejected”], Porten 1968, 81 n.89, Porten-Yardeni; cf. Grelot “farine grise”<sup>183</sup> or “refined” (= \**ramya*-: Hinz 1975, 198, Lindenberger 2002, 91, Muraoka & Porten 2003, 345, Tavernier 2007, 406), the latter a word certainly used of cereal in the Persepolis texts (see below). *Dmy* is understood as \**dāmya*- “of the house, common”, hence “plain, ordinary, low-grade”: Tavernier 2007, 405, after Shaked 2004, 41. It is not in doubt that it is an inferior grade to “white” (it is always given in larger quantities), and *dmy* is perhaps the simple way, linguistically speaking, of getting that effect. *Rmy*, by contrast, may seem too dismissive (“rejected”) for something that is nonetheless being distributed to a relatively privileged recipient (Whitehead 1974, 68 observed that a *pqyd* surely should not be given inferior flour) or too euphemistic (“refined”: OInd *ramyá* means “delicate, fine”) for something that is not highest grade. But it is hard to be sure about the semantics of such things. There is apparently a grade of flour even finer than “white” in one of the Bactrian documents (ADAB C1:14), described with the unexplained word *smyd*, but, though interesting in its own right, that does little to resolve the present question. (A three-grade system for grain, both wheat- and barley-flour, recurs in Polyaeus 4.32.3, viz. pure or very pure [(*karta*) *katharos*]; second-class [*deuteros*], third-class [*tritros*].<sup>184</sup>) Similarly unhelpful is the complaint of Bagaiča- in ADAB B2 that he has been sent flour of such “ordinary” (*dmy*) quality that he effectively has no usable ration at all, for we do not independently know how high a status Bagaiča- enjoyed or how self-regardingly picky he may have been.

At Persepolis at least five different words are sometimes used to describe flour. Three (*mariya*, *manuya* and *battimanuya*), are found together on three occasions (PF 699-700, PFNN 0174). Since all three seem to connote high quality (“excellent, exceeding, eminent”: Tavernier 2007, 406–7) and since in the three texts in question they describe a single lot of flour, not three different lots, it is hard to see that they can represent three significantly different quality-grades. (Were it so, the text ought to record the separate quantities for each grade.) Each of the words does also occur separately (and not only in reference to flour) and could evidently operate by itself as a marker of high quality. (The case of *mariya* is rather more complicated because it also appears – perhaps representing a different OP word – as the designation of a food-product.) Henkelman 2010, 680 n.35 suggests that, although all three words occurring together are to be “read as a whole, not as a grading scale” (as an indication that the flour in question is really top quality?), “actual grades are .... the explanation for the sequence *mariya*, *mannuya*, *battimanuya*, even though the expression itself was not used in a literal sense”. This is said against the background of the tripartite flour-grading of Polyaeus and the Bactrian letters, but it is not entirely clear whether we are to understand that the three words describe those three grades or just that the rhetorical use of three words for excellence reflects an environment familiar with tripartite flour-grading. The other two flour-descriptions (though they too are not confined to flour) are *ramiya* and *bašur*, and, as they are found in the same document of two different lots of flour in three texts (326, K3-0014, D-0030), they can denote different qualities/characteristics. (*Bašur* also occurs alongside – and designating a separate lot from -- *battimanuya* in B-0905.) *Ramiya* simply means “fine” (and might be one of the words used in A6.9). *Bašur* is more complicated: in at least two cases it is

<sup>183</sup> Whitehead cites Segert 1956, 386 as giving “inferior” for *rmy*, but this seems to be a false reference. (Segert there discusses “white”).

<sup>184</sup> 1000 artabai divides into 400, 300 and 300 in the case of wheat, and 200, 400 and 400 in the case of barley. Only in the case of the “very pure” barley-meal do these figures suggest a significant distinction in quality.

connected with a funeral monument (*šumar*) and seems to designate a place where offerings were put. (The word regularly has the logogram for place.) This raises the possibility that, as a designation for flour or other things, it is marking them as “offering-grade”, something distinct from (but also, as a species of description, in a different class from) both “fine” (*ramiya*) and “excellent” (*battimanuya*). I would certainly not suggest mapping *these* three grades on to the three grades of other sources. Leaving *bašur* to one side, the fact that one can have both *battimanuya* and (merely) *ramiya* does keep open the possibility that A6.9 refers to a second-level grade of flour as *rmy*.

line 3 *hmr 'w škr*, “wine or beer”. Perhaps left open to allow for different local customs in the geographically diverse area covered by the journey as much as to give Nakhtḥor a genuine choice when both options are available. (*Škr* actually designates any non-grape-based alcoholic drink.)

line 3 [...]*r*, “cheese (?)”. Lindenberger also opts for [...]*r* rather than [...]*d*. One theoretical possibility is *'mr* = “lamb”, but this seems unlikely, partly because it would be extravagant provision for what is in the end not *that* high-status a party, partly because one would expect such a major provision to be listed first. (Moreover, the commodity should arguably be *qn* = sheep, rather than *'mr* = lamb. *Qn* is the word encountered in ADAB C5.). A less dramatic option is an Aramaic equivalent of *\*panīra-* = “cheese”. The absence of a (weight) measure would be consistent with this, on the evidence of the Babylonian Arshama contracts (Van Driel 1993, 222,241) and ADAB C1:24 (Henkelman 2010, 735).

line 3 *wl'lymwhy*, “and for his servants”. Nakhtḥor has servants, and the Cilicians and an artisan in line 4 are Arshama’s servants; but Nakhtḥor is not Arshama’s “servant”, at least not in the rhetoric of a document such as this -- cf. A6.3:1 n.: Psamshek is only called a servant when he is not being called a *pqyd*. The tone in which Arshama writes to Nakhtḥor elsewhere proves, of course, that “servant” would have been an entirely appropriate description for the relationship.

line 4 *lqbl rkšh*, “in proportion to his horses”. Is it surprising that no limit is stated for the number of horses? Was each member of the party to have (precisely) one horse, so that specifying the number was otiose? Or (on the contrary) was it taken for granted that the only horses in such a party would be one for Nakhtḥor to ride and a couple more as pack-animals, so that it was again otiose to say more? Persepolis travel documents only relatively rarely mention humans and animals together<sup>185</sup> – nor is the haul of documents recording travel rations for animals alone (category S3) very large, though some S1 texts may actually belong to S3 (Hallock 1969, 50 notes one case). Sticking to texts relating to equids, there is considerable variation in the size of groups and the relationship in number between humans and horses. In travel texts reporting parties of a comparable size to Nakhtḥor’s, the number of horses (or horses and mules) can be significantly smaller than the number of humans (PFNN 0878, PFNN 2018, PFNN 2396), but can also be the same (PFNN 1803: ten of each) or larger (PFNN 2656:1-4 has 7 people and 10 horses).

line 4 *rkšh*, “his horses”. For this word for “horse” cf. A3.11:2,5 (context fairly opaque) and Naveh 1981: 155 no. 6 (Arad), a reference to 12 “sons of horses” (*bny rkš*), i.e. colts, together

---

<sup>185</sup> See 1300, 1338, 1397, 1418, 1467, 1508, 1570, 1571, 1942:19-22, 2056, PFa 29:56-57, Fort.7110, NN 0431, NN 0447, NN 0878, NN 1076, NN 1515, NN 1565, NN 1656, NN 1803, NN 1878, NN 2018, NN 2326, NN 2396, NN 2569, NN 2580, NN 2658: 1-5. “Horsemen” are mentioned without horses in 1367, 1370, NN 0667, NN 0980, NN 1515, Fort.7902.

with a quantity of barley (for their sustenance?) – a situation with vague resonances of that in the present document. In A6.12:2 the term for the horse to be created (along with a rider) by the image-maker Hinzani is *swsh*. According to Fales 2012 Aramaic *rkš* (like the Hebrew equivalent) may once have designated draft-horses, as opposed to ones to be ridden (*sws*), but this distinction had disappeared by the fifth century, and *Esther* 8.10,14 in due course uses (Hebrew) *rkš* of the horses employed by Achaemenid royal messengers. (Fales is principally concerned with the connection between Aramaic *rkš* and the Assyrian words *rakkasu*, *raksu* and <sup>lu</sup>*raksu*, the conclusion being that the last term designates a horse-trainer or horse-quartermaster, and presupposes the application of *rkš* to [riding] horses already in Assyrian period Aramaic.)

line 4 *'mn*, “artisan”. Grelot 1972, 312 says that the word elsewhere designates an architect or sculptor (citing Hebrew *'mon* and Akkadian *ummānu* = “maitre d’oeuvre”). In the present case he translates it as “ouvrier”, but glosses “technicien du bâtiment”. (Cazelles 1954 already saw the *'mn* as “peut-être un architecte ou un maçon... en tout cas, un artisan”.) The term recurs in A6.10, the instruction to assemble *grd 'mnn wšpzn* (“*garda* artisans of every kind”) – which may suggest one should not restrict the possible range for *'mn* too much. The term appears in PFAT 184, 193, 261 (cf. Azzoni 2008, 262). About PFAT 261 I have no information, but in the first two cases the *'mnn* or *'mny* are ration-receivers, divided (in a standard Persepolitan fashion) into “freemen” (*hrn*) and boys (*lmnn*); and in PFAT 184 at least they are on a journey.

line 5 *mn pqyd 'l pqyd ... mn mdynh 'l mdynh*, “from (one) official to (the next) official... from province to province”. On the implications for the link between *pqyd* and province see A6.4:2 n.

line 5 *'dwn*, “route”. This corresponds to Iranian *\*advan-*, “path, travel route” (Tavernier 2007, 446). Greenfield 1982 drew attention in this context to the later Aramaic word *'awana* (written *'wwn*’, according to Jastrow 1950 and Sokoloff 2002, 86). This normally means “station, dwelling, resting place (including in funerary sense)”, but in Babylonian Aramaic its use is confined to (a) references to the measurement of distance by so-and-so-many stopping-places on a journey and (b) places where food can be got during a journey.<sup>186</sup> (There is also a word *'wwnkr*’ = traveller, trader: Sokoloff 2002, 86.) For Rundgren 1965/66, 75-79 *'awana* resulted from contamination between the Iranian words *āvahana* (village) and *\*avāhana* (a place where one unsaddles horses), but Greenfield suggested that it derived from *\*advana* through an intermediate *\*awana*. If so, later usage might be thought to reinforce the suspicion that the appearance of the Iranian term *\*advan-* in the present document reflects Nakhthor’s use of a formally established and controlled route. In other words, there may be a quasi-administrative concept lurking behind *'dwn*.

line 5 *ptp' znh... Mšryn*, “give them this ration...until he shall reach Egypt”. This is *prima facie* formulated as though the document exhaustively covers provisions for the whole trip – an effect that may seem to be underlined by the fact that it is followed by a further instruction about the rules governing supply of rations (“and if he should be in (any) one place more than one day then for those days you shall not give them further rations”). The reference to Egypt is not a casual one right at the end of the instructions but apparently well-embedded in those instructions. But the effect is mitigated if one recalls the letter’s ring-composition structure (see above). Given the correspondence between lines 5-6 and lines 2-3, one may feel that “until he reaches Egypt” simply a differently phrased re-statement of Nakhthor’s ultimate

---

<sup>186</sup> *'wn*’ is also the name of a place on the Tigris (Jastrow).

destination, a destination that may lie beyond the practical purview of the present document. On this view *'d ymṭ' Mšryn* really only signifies “on his way to Egypt”.<sup>187</sup>

line 6 *ytyr mn ywm hd*, “more than one day”. cf. *ywm lywm* (line 3 with n.). The stress on not stopping recalls the instruction in many Neo-Babylonian letters that a messenger should not stay overnight once he has delivered his message (cf. CAD s.v. *nubattu* (2a)).

line 6 *'hr*, “then”. See A6.7:6,7 n.

---

<sup>187</sup> It would be nice if one could *translate* the phrase as “in order that he (will) reach Egypt”. But this would be an eccentric use of *'d* – or rather we would expect to have *zy 'd* (A6.13:3, A4.7:27) or *'d zy* (A4.8:26); cf. Muraoka & Porten 2003, 333 (with n.1270).

## A6.10 = Driver 7 = Grelot 68 = Lindenberger 43

### Preserving and enhancing an estate

#### Summary

Arshama tells Nakhtḥor to preserve and enhance his estate during a time of disturbance.

#### Date

None given.

#### Text

There are no significant uncertainties (except in the external summary). As usual Lindenberger is more conservative in the placing of square brackets and the marking of letters as damaged though reasonably certain.

#### Structure of letter

Whitehead 1974, 184 rightly comments on the 2+2 structure of the letter and the repetition of a four-fold framework (guard my property; so there will be no loss; and seek more workers; and add to estate) as a notable example of the rhetorical force of repetition. See also A6.7:6-8 n.

line 1 *Smšk*. An alternative writing of Psamshek, found only here in Aramaic texts. Lindenberger regards it as a scribal error and prints <p>*smšk*, perhaps rightly.

line 1 *mrđt*, “rebelled”. See A6.7:6 n. Note that Lindenberger begs questions by translating “during the *recent* Egyptian uprising...” (my italics).

line 1 *grđ*, “personnel”. Iranian \**garda-*, “domestic staff, workman” (Tavernier 2007, 423). See in general Briant 2002, 429-439, 456-60, 940-942, 944-945. Also found in A6.12 and A6.15, at Persepolis (PFAT 168, 408 and Aramaic epigraphs on a number of cuneiform tablets,<sup>188</sup> as well as *passim* in the Elamite form *kurtaš*) and (as *gardu*) in a number of Babylonian texts.<sup>189</sup> VS 3.138 (= 3.139 = BM 42383) shows some *gardu* receiving rations in 497 (7.5.26 Darius I) alongside *magi* and “palace officials (*mār ekalli*) of the Bit-hare” (cf. 6.12:2 n.). In the Murašū archive we encounter royal *gardu* (BE 10.127)<sup>190</sup> and the *gardu* are pre-eminently connected with the Crown Prince Estate (Stolper 1985, 94).<sup>191</sup> There is also a *ḥaṭru* of the *gardu* (10.92, PBS 2/1 2), which may interconnect with the idea of the land or fields of *gardu* encountered in

---

<sup>188</sup> PFNN 0486, PFNN 0495. Its presence has also been reported on a number of other epigraphs.

<sup>189</sup> Tavernier lists thirteen: add BM 120024, BM 4283 (a duplicate of VS 3.138/3.139), CBS 5316 = JCS 2001, 94-5 (arable land of the king and of the *gardu*-workers: the concept of arable land (*zeru*) of the *gardu* recurs in BE 9.101, 10.32,92,127, and that of fields (*eqlate*) of the *gardu* in PBS 2/1 2,13,160,204) and BRM 2.41,44 (Seleucid texts from 160 and 158 BC). Compare also the title \**grđapatiš*, preserved in Elamite *kurdabattiš* and Akkadian *gardapatal/gardapatu* (Tavernier 2007, 424: add EE 111: the holders have non-Iranian names) – at least if this is taken as “chief of \**grda*-workers” rather than “majordomus, steward” (on this cf. Tavernier 2007, 423-4, Stolper 1985, 57) – and the newly revealed, ill-understood but apparently high-status official, the *gardu-ambaru* in BM 120024, who is conceivably identical with a so-called “satrap” in PBS 2/1 2. I am not entirely sure where the EN-a *ša gardu* (master of *gardu*) in IMT 32 fits in. On the Babylonian evidence see Dandamaev 1985, 568-584, even though it is now slightly out-of-date.

<sup>190</sup> Just as there are *kurtaš* of the king at Persepolis: PF 1092, PF 1127; PFNN 1747; Fort.5466.

<sup>191</sup> We can also locate some *gardu* in the vicinity of the “town of the Carians” (BE 9.15, PBS 2/1 104).

some Babylonian texts (cf. footnote). On the other hand in Darius' Behistun text (§14) one of the elements of the property Darius restored after the elimination of Gaumata comes out in Elamite as *kur-taš a-ak hul-hi<sup>meš</sup> mar-[x x]-ip-ma* (perhaps “workers and estate-artisans”), which seems to dissociate *kurtaš* (i.e. *grd'*) from estates, and although one *might* read the OP and Akkadian versions (which in any case only contain *one* word referring to workers) as making a closer link, that would not plainly give us the authority to change our reading of the Elamite one.<sup>192</sup> The *kurtaš* of the Persepolis archive, even if not explicitly associated with particular individual's estates,<sup>193</sup> are certainly the deployable property and resource of the state (one might say of the state's estate) – indeed this is their distinguishing feature, and one for which the Babylonian evidence is on the whole parallel rather than contradictory (Stolper 1985, 58).<sup>194</sup> The *grd* in the present document are at least potentially branded or tattooed workers, and nothing in other Bodleian letters really contradicts what that implies about their (possible) status. The Persepolitan and Babylonian evidence affords no comparably direct view of the status of *kurtaš/gardu*, though (in an ancient context at any rate) we will not naturally think that large (sometimes very large) managed groups of workers are made up of individuals with much personal autonomy. The fact that Persepolitan *kurtaš* lived in family groups (if that *is* a fact we can properly infer from the presence of both genders and the records of parturition<sup>195</sup>) does not much affect this. The attempt of Aperghis 2000 to demonstrate deliberate mistreatment (by under-feeding) of male *kurtaš* is perhaps not quite cogent (cf. Tuplin 2007, 317-318), but his sense that *kurtaš* in general were more like slaves than anything else is understandable,<sup>196</sup> and the possibility that even Persians might fall into *kurtaš* status<sup>197</sup> need not be incompatible. Stolper 1985, 59 wondered whether the appearance of *gardu* and associated officials in Babylonia implied the existence there of a royal economic apparatus comparable in type, scale and complexity to that in Persepolis. The issue of scale and complexity remains hard to assess, certainly, but the evidence of *grd'* in Egypt certainly reinforces the belief that this sort of situation existed outside Fars (cf. Briant 2002, 456-459). One thing that seems to differentiate the Persepolitan and Babylonian models is that in the latter *gardu* can be not only ration-

<sup>192</sup> As *\*grda-* is etymologically associated with “house” and as the word for “estate” is the same as the word for “house”, one might even feel an element of duplication in the Elamite.

<sup>193</sup> For association of Persepolitan *kurtaš* and so-called “estates” cf. PF 1368, which reveals a *kurdabattiš* who apportions at an estate (*irmatam*): he is actually the regional director for Fahliyan, so this is rather a high-level arrangement. The *tašsup* (“people”?) who are “written” by a registration-officer (*karamaraš*) at an estate (*appišdamana*) in NN 2556 are presumably not *kurtaš*. In NN 1022 DIN.TAR makers are provisioned from the normal state-system at an estate (*ulhi*), but it is hard to know whether they belong to the estate permanently. The Babylonian wood-cutters provisioned from an estate in NN 1999 are pretty certainly a temporary presence. So too the 1500 workers travelling to Irtuppiya's *appišdamana* (1527)? But note that Henkelman (2010, 699-700) entertains the possibility that Irtuppiya is a steward tending (part of) the royal estate – a Nakhtḥor-like figure? – which might change the situation.

<sup>194</sup> Babylonian *gardu* can be seen as institutional slaves, like *širkutu* and *šūšānu* (Jursa, Paskowiak & Waerzeggers 2003-4, 257).

<sup>195</sup> PFAT 100 speaks of five men, six women and “their boys” (*lymhm*) but, while this probably guarantees that *lym* here means “boy, child”, not “servant, slave” (Azzoni 2007, 261), I am not sure whether it (unconsciously) reveals something about social organisation.

<sup>196</sup> When selling a slave at Persepolis Bel-iddin assumed guaranty against suits (brought by) improper or proper claimants (to the slave) (and against suits claiming) the status of king's slave [LÚ.ARAD.LUGAL], free citizen, temple oblate, (or) [unclear term] for the slave (Fort.11786, Stolper 1984, 302-303). Anyone selling a royal *kurtaš* would surely have infringed this provision.

<sup>197</sup> Briant 2002, 334, on the assumption that the “Persian boys (*puhu*)” who write texts are (like many other “boys”) *kurtaš*. He suggests such loss of status could be the result of punishment or impoverishment.

receivers (cf. 6.12:2 n.) but also land-allotment holders (cf. above). Which model applied in Egypt is a nice question. The image-maker Hinzani (with the “people of his household”) might sound like a candidate for land-holding *grd* (A6.12); but he is actually on record there as a ration-receiver. (One thing, incidentally, that sets him apart from all the other *kurtaš* and *gardu* known to us is his lack of anonymity.)

line 1 *grd' wnksy'*, “personnel and goods”. The “goods” (cf. next n.) appear regularly alongside the *grd'*, but not explicitly in the statements about *addition* to the estate, except in lines 2-3 in reference to Psamshek’s activities on the earlier occasion: *he* adds both explicitly. In Arshama’s earlier message to Nakhthor on the present occasion (ll.6-7) only the gathering (and branding) of new *grd* is specified; the parallel bits in 4-5 and 9 are simply vague. But it might be unwise to conclude that Arshama now only wants new workers and not new *nksy*.

line 1 etc. *nksy'*, *nksn*, *nksy* = “goods”. An Akkadian borrowing (Kaufman 1974, 77; Muraoka & Porten 2003, 349): cf. *nikkassu*: CAD s.v. (3) pp.229). In Egyptian Aramaic texts *nksy* are portable (A4.4, B7.2; distinct from a house: D23.1 iii-iv:8, vA: 6<sup>198</sup>), consumable (B2.7; perhaps specifically food in D1.11<sup>199</sup>) and stealable by fugitive slaves (A6.3:5), and include clothing (but contrast Saqqara 50) and assorted domestic items (e.g. mirrors, trays, utensils, furnishings, oil, non-precious metal). Silver is normally treated as distinct (A4.5, B2.6, B3.3, B4.6, B6.4 B7.3 [palimpsest]), though this is not the case in B2.8:4 and (perhaps) B3.8:23.

The word also appears in the Aramaic version of a notorious passage of DB (§14). Unfortunately the text is almost entirely lost; all that remains is *nksyhwm wbtm* (their “property and houses”) and this does not map directly onto the better-preserved versions in other languages, precisely because they do not contain the sort of generic word for “property” that *nksy* appears to be. The problem is further compounded by the fact that the order of items is different in the Akkadian version from that in the OP and Elamite; one may expect – but one cannot be sure – that the Aramaic version would resemble the Akkadian (as it certainly does in some other respects). The upshot is *either* (a) that *nksy* does *not* correspond to anything specific in the other versions and indeed may represent a simplification of the other versions, in which case it might embrace fields, animals and (dependent) workers *or* (b) that it corresponds to just one or other of fields *or* animals *or* (dependent) workers. To use *nksy* of real estate (“fields”) would run counter to the indications of other Aramaic evidence texts; but it is applicable to flocks of animals in some of the (later) non-Egyptian uses of the word in Hoftijzer-Jongeling 1995, and one could speculate that, if it was applicable to flocks of animals, it might in principle be applicable to (so to say) flocks of dependent people.

In Arshama’s letter, of course, there is a distinction between *grd'* and *nksy*, so of the possibilities suggested by DB §14 only animals would remain; and Grelot 1972, 314 did indeed (without comment) translate *nksn* as “troupeaux” in line 3. But elsewhere in the letter he put simply “biens”, and this has to be the safest option.

line 2 *zylky....zyly*, “our....my”. A slightly unexpected plural: “the previous *pqyd* Psamshek guarded our *garda* and property in Egypt so that there was no diminution in my estate”. David Taylor (personal communication) says there is no likelihood of the “royal we”. Whitehead 1974 notes the plural, but makes no further comment. No one offers an explanation. Similar unexpected plurals in reference to Nakhthor (see below, note on line 5) can be speculatively explained as reflecting the existence of an entourage of colleagues. Does Arshama momentarily

---

<sup>198</sup> Presumably the confiscation of goods as a punishment in Ezra 7.26 *did* include real estate.

<sup>199</sup> In the light of a prospective bribe consisting of silver and 1000 ardabs of grain (A4.10), one might wonder whether the “silver and goods [*nksyn*]” in A4.5:4 and A4.8:5 included foodstuffs.

see himself as one of a class of *garda*-and-property holders – which is, of course, what he was? The complaint in lines 3f involves reference to other “lords” (i.e. involves placing Arshama within the larger class, while distinguishing his experience as peculiarly bad). Perhaps that perspective is momentarily anticipated – if illogically so, since Psamshek was presumably just Arshama’s *pqyd*.

line 2 *ksntw*, “loss”. Perhaps Iranian *\*kasunaθva-* = “loss, decrease” (Tavernier 2007, 444), though Elizabeth Tucker advises caution (personal communication). The word recurs in lines 6,8.

line 2-3 *grd ’mnn wspzn*, “personnel of artisans of every kind”. The same phrase recurs in lines 6-7. Whitehead 1974, 73 regards *grd* here and in 6-7 (as well as in A6.12:2 [*grd bdkrn*]) as absolute in apposition to the words that follow, not a singular construct, giving a translation “domestic staff, craftsmen of all kinds”. (Elsewhere in the present letter [4,5,6] and in 6.15:8-9 we have the emphatic *grd’*.) Lindenberger ignores *grd* here and in line 7, rendering simply “artisans of all kinds”.

line 3 *wspzn*, “of every kind”. Iranian *vispazana-* = of all kinds (cf. line 7). *Vispazana* and its Elamite equivalent (*mišbazana*) = “containing all tribes, all kinds of men” (Tavernier 2007, 34,78) occurs in DNa, DSe, DZc and (Elamite only) DPa, in the royal titlature. The word is also used (in Elamite garb) in various Persepolis texts<sup>200</sup> in reference to grain (1223), fowl (1747-1749, NN 0574, NN 0790, NN 1544, NN 1664, NN 1674), horses (NN 0726) -- and (as in the present text) workers (PT 79): indeed *marrip mišbazana* (Hinz-Koch 1987 s.v.; Cameron originally took it as the name of the “Gateway of All Races”) is a rather close parallel to *’mnn wspzn*. Benveniste (1958, 60f) went further and postulated *\*grda kṛnuvaka vispazana* as an equivalent for the entire phrase *grd ’mnn wspzn*.<sup>201</sup> The absence of endings on *wspzn* indicates that the word remains an unassimilated borrowing: was there an element of technical term or cliché about the use of *vispazana* in Persian bureaucratic language?<sup>202</sup> Stolper 1997, 133 n.2 questions Benveniste’s view that in PT 79 the workers are “of all kinds”, not “all races”, insisting that, since PFT identifies workers by nationality, it is likely that the 1149 workers of PT 79 *did* include various nationalities.<sup>203</sup> But (a) it seems less than obvious that different ethnicities is what Arshama has in mind, (b) *\*zana-* (which Stolper wants to retain a specific connection with “tribe” or “race”) seems to lack ethnic overtones when it appears as a loanword in A6.1:3 and so may not necessarily have had it in all OP uses.

line 3 *šmy’ ly*, “heard by me”. The passive form perhaps reveals a calque of Persian idiom (Whitehead 1974, 73, 236; Ciancaglini 2008, 31).<sup>204</sup> Compare A3.3:13, *šmy’ ln* = “it was heard

<sup>200</sup> Tavernier also cites PFNN 1517, but the relevant word does not appear there; this is a wrong reference for PFNN 0790, resulting from confusion between Fort.669-1 = PFNN 0790 and Fort.969-1 = PFNN 1517.

<sup>201</sup> In DSf §3j OP *kṛnuvaka-* (1.47) corresponds to Elamite *marrip* (1.41) and Akkadian *ummānu* (1.32). (For the texts cf. Stève 1987, 64-77.) Tavernier 2007, 427, dealing with indirect attestations of *kṛnuvaka* in Elamite *kurnuka* (PT 14, PT 31, PT 1963-1, PF 1611, PFNN 434 PFNN 1216) renders it “stonemason”, which would not suit the generality Benveniste ascribed to his phrase.

<sup>202</sup> For the grammatical phenomenon cf. *hndyz* in A6.7:6, *hnškr* in ADAB A1:2, and the comments in Naveh & Shaked 2012, 53 on similar but more problematic cases in other Bactrian texts.

<sup>203</sup> Benveniste 1958: 63 also canvassed, but rejected, the possibility that the phrase designated “ouvriers à tout faire”, i.e. non-specialists

<sup>204</sup> Oddly, though, the Aramaic rendering of DB does not use this trope when translating an OP example (*manā kartam* in DB §10 becomes *’bdyt* in C2.1:2).

by us” – this time not a Persian official letter, but one between Jews, albeit ones connected with the Elephantine garrison. See also A6.15:1 n. Arshama has heard of Nakht̥or’s failings – but from whom? The same question arises about the information about the Cilicians in A6.7 (cf. A6.7:6-8 n.). Elsewhere his source of information and/or requests for action is clearer: Psamshek (A6.3, A6.8), Nakht̥or (A6.6 – presumably: the text is damaged), Peṭosiri (A6.11), Varuvahya (A6.13), a group of officials (A6.1), and a succession of officials and others (A6.2: the report from the boatmen in Elephantine has passed through two intermediaries). In the Bactrian letters Akhvamazda responds to information from Vahuvakhshu (A1) and Vahya-ātar the *pqyd* (A6), as well as responding to messages from Bagavant (A2, A4). Both Psamshek and Vahya-ātar bear the title *pqyd*, which makes their denunciations of Armapiya (A6.8) and Bagavant (A6) formally rather similar (though does not imply Armapiya and Bagavant are of similar status: see A6.8:1 n.). Vahuvakhshu (who has a specifically Bactrian name and, unusually, is given his patronymic) has no title but stands in some relation to the camel-keepers whose problems are the burden of the letter (expressed by their being his *hnškr̥t*, perhaps “apprentice-servants”). In the Bodleian letters named sources are people with a clear stake in the matter at hand, whether as *pqydyn* or other officials whose job it is to make estate or other official business go properly<sup>205</sup> or as individuals who want their private interests served or protected (Peṭosiri, Varuvahya), and the same clearly applies in the Bactrian letters. Perhaps it is deliberate that the source of information about Nakht̥or’s failings in A6.10 is not revealed to the object of complaint. (It is less obvious that there might be a reason for concealing the source in A6.7.) The (anonymous) informer is a stereotype of authoritarian regimes, but that is no reason to deny the validity of Greek perceptions that the Achaemenid King (and by extension is satrapal vice-gerents and other officials) depended on his “eyes” and “ears”.<sup>206</sup> This does not mean that we should discover such people specifically in bearers of titles such as *\*azdakara* (A6.1) or even – a favourite in this context -- *\*gaušaka-* (A4.5:9).

line 4 [*bth*]tyt’, “[in Low]er (Egypt)”. Lewis 1958 suggested that l.4 should refer to officials in Upper Egypt, not Lower Egypt, (a) in order for there to be a contrast between Nakht̥or, who is definitely in Lower Egypt [line 11], and the other officials, and (b) for reasons of spacing (which he did not articulate).

As to sense: there is a contrast between Arshama’s *pqyd* and those of other lords (*mr’yhm* = “their lords”), so the point may be precisely that Nakht̥or is in the same region of Egypt as the successful *pqydyn*. (The reading *mr’yhm* is not in doubt, as the word recurs in line 5. The fact that Driver’s translation had “lord’s” [sc. staff, estate], not “lords”, may have caused misunderstanding. )

As to reading: Driver and Porten-Yardeni read [*bth*]tyt’. Porten-Yardeni put dots on the *yod* and *aleph*; Driver has bars over the *tavs* and the *yod*. (His bars are supposed to mean that a letter is broken.) Lewis’s alternative would be *b’t’t*, one letter shorter. On the face of it the presence of two *tavs* is assured, in which case Lewis cannot be right. But the Bodleian photograph suggests that, while *t’* at the end is fairly reliable (though Porten-Yardeni dot the *aleph*), the rest is lost or arguable. It does seem highly unlikely that a *lamed* was present; that

<sup>205</sup> We see the same phenomenon indirectly in Masapata’s denunciations of Nakht̥or to Virafsha (A6.15).

<sup>206</sup> Xenophon gives a good account in *Cyr.*8.2.10-12 of the multiplicity of spies in the system. This does not preclude there being a spymaster (Herodotus’ King’s Eye: 1.114,120), as Xenophon himself implicitly knows (8.6.16). Xenophon also knew (*ibid.*, *Oec.*4.6) that there was open inspection of subordinates’ performance as well as reliance on self-interested denunciation. Since some of the objects of inspection were likely to be “sons of the house”, it is not surprising that the inspectors might be figured as sons or brothers of the king.

should project well above the line and into parchment that is well-preserved. The mark before the *t* of *t'* might be a *yod*. But I have to say that the mark before that is not obviously part of another *tav* (any more than of a *lamed*). One wonders if either reading is at all certain. What is not entirely clear is whether Porten-Yardeni actually claim to have discerned the lower part of a second *tav* where the photograph shows nothing.

The question is substantively important, since Lewis's reading would explicitly locate current "disturbances" in both parts of Egypt. It would also have a bearing on how we understand the labelling of Nakhthor as *pqyd* in Lower Egypt in line 11. (See Introduction p.33.)

On the meaning of Upper and Lower Egypt in these texts cf. A6.4:2 n. Any reference to Papremis in A6.15 would *prima facie* put Nakhthor in the conventional Lower Egypt. Historians are also very ready to believe in disturbances in the Delta -- again Lower Egypt, in conventional terms.

line 4 *šwzy'*, "disturbances (?)". A *hapax legomenon* apparently meaning "troubles, disturbances" (though Whitehead remarked that, so far as context goes, the word *could* be a GN). Considered possibly Iranian by Porten & Lund 2002 s.v. and Muraoka & Porten 2003, 345, it is not recognized as such in Tavernier 2007. Driver compared Syriac *'wzy*, "calcitravit". Grelot thought it of Akkadian origin, drawing attention to *ezzu* = furious, *ezēzu* = be furious. *Šūzuzu* = "make furious" would be particularly close. The similarity to *ywz'* = *\*yauza-* in A6.11:2 is tantalising. David Taylor (personal communication) had speculated that *šwzy* and *ywz'* might both be attempts at same word, with the first letter of *šwzy* identified as an Akkadian causative prefix. – On the substantive reference of *šwzy'* see A6.7:6 n. and Introduction pp.40-44. Note that Lindenberger again (cf. above, note on line 1) speaks of "*recent* outbreaks" (my italics), thus both adding something that is not in the text and rather occluding the distinction between the troubles here, which are current, and those in line 1, which lie in the past.

lines 5-10 The shift between plural (5,6,7,9) and singular second person (8,10) is notable. (See above for a similar shift.<sup>207</sup>) The plural is not used as a standard form of *politesse* in Aramaic; when Arshama addresses plural people he has in mind a plurality, effectively Nakhthor and his staff or other associates;<sup>208</sup> he switches to singular in ll.8,10 when he issues very direct threats at him personally (even though in the middle of doing so he reverts to plural forms in l.9). Grelot 1972, 315 seems to have taken the plurals in line 5 to show that there had been a previous letter to all the *pqydy*n ("tous les régisseurs des domaines"): I assume that this is what he means by "un détail de la ligne 5". But this does not take account of the fact that the plural "you" is already encountered in "you are not doing this" (which must mean Nakhthor). Grelot also speculated that what is now A6.6 (= Driver frag. 5.1) belonged in this context, perhaps even (he means?) was this earlier letter. A6.6 does refer to something being removed from Arshama's domains, but since it is now claimed that the person whose message *to* Arshama is mentioned in this fragment was Nakhthor, the relationship probably cannot be what Grelot imagined it might be.

lines 6-7 *mn 'tr 'hnr....byt' zyly*, "from elsewhere....my estate". Arshama tells Nakhthor not just to guard existing *garda* and goods but to seek additional "personnel of artisans" and bring them "my courtyard", brand them and make them over to his estate. One would like to be sure

<sup>207</sup> See also A6.15:6 for a further possible (but unlikely) case.

<sup>208</sup> One may initially think of Kenzasirma and the accountants (A6.11-14); but just because we hear of them in those letters does not necessarily mean they are relevant in this one. Given the imputation in A6.14 that the responsibilities of a *pqyd* could be carried out by a brother or son (and the fact that the function of *pqyd* might pass from father to son), the unspoken objects of threat might even include family members. On the issue of "colleagues" cf. A6.3:7 n.

whether this is merely a specific application of a standing requirement for *pqyd* or one peculiar to the time of disturbance. Endemic labour shortage (A6.7:9 n.) rather favours the former, though clearly acquisition of new resources will always be easier when the general situation is uneasy. Some would hold in any case that a sharp dichotomy between disturbance and normality is false. Eyre 1996 argues that the disorderly landscape of Roman Egypt is not peculiar to that period but was a structural feature in the pharaonic era too, not least because of the propensity of tax-collecting to lead to violence (189-190). “Le desordre rurale, je crois, a toujours été normal en Égypte.” This can presumably apply in the Persian era too. Nor was the particular behaviour Arshama enjoined upon Nakhthor necessarily something alien to Egyptian tradition imported by a foreign conqueror. When the First Intermediate Period butler Merer of Edfu affirms “I acquired cattle, I acquired people, I acquired fields, I acquired copper. I nourished my brothers and sisters” (Černy 1961, Lichtheim 1973/1980, 1.87), he gives, in a rather matter-of-fact way, a valuable insight into what had probably always counted as reasonable, even virtuous, action for those whose station gave them the opportunity to enhance their wealth.

line 7 *trbš*, “courtyard”. This reproduces Akkadian *tarbašu* (Kaufman 1974, 107; Muraoka & Porten 2003, 350), a word variously used of animal-pens or the court of a temple or palace (CAD 18.217-221 [meaning 1]) -- a combination reminiscent to the range of associations of Greek *aulê*, a word that moved from the farmyard to the palace).<sup>209</sup> In Egyptian Aramaic *trbš* recurs in B3.7:4, B3.10:4,7,14,15 B3.4:4, B3.11:3 in reference to part of a house, for which the equivalent Egyptian term (sometimes used instead of *trbš*) was *hyt*. Elsewhere in the Achaemenid empire *trbš* is found in a fourth century Lydian text (Gusmani 1964, 1 = KAI 260: 349 BC) as part of the property of a future tomb-desecrator against which the destructive vengeance of Artemis Koloe and Artemis of Ephesus is invoked: *trbšh byth qnynh tyn wmyw wwnd'mth wbdwrnh wyrth*, i.e. “his *trbš*, his house, his possessions, earth, water and whatever is his they are to destroy and his inheritance” (*wyrth* seems an afterthought).

As an architectural feature in the documents in TADAE II, it is variously seen as a courtyard (Porten-Yardeni) or porch (Hoftijzer-Jongeling 1995 s.v.), the latter translation being prompted specially by the connotations of Demotic *hyt* (cf. Glanville 1939, xxxiii, Erichsen 1954, 377 [“Vorhalle, Eingang”], Porten 1968, 95 n.173, 98 n.185).<sup>210</sup> In the present letter the term is translated “court” or “cour” by Driver, Grelot and Porten-Yardeni, as it is by Lemaire in the Lydian text<sup>211</sup> (cf. Donner-Röllig’s “Hof”, Driver’s “courtyard”),<sup>212</sup> but a question remains about what it signifies.

Driver seems to have thought of it as the court of the satrap *qua* representative of the king, rather as though it were equivalent to the metonymic use of “gate(s)” to mean palace.<sup>213</sup>

<sup>209</sup> Donner-Röllig cite Hebrew *tarbeš* = “Lagerstätte” in Ezek.24.5, Zeph.2.15 (but BDBG reads the word as *marbeš*) and Syriac *tarbašu* = “atrium”. Driver notes Targ.-Aram *trbyš*’ = “hall”. Most strikingly Sokoloff 2002 records both *tarbiša* = “type of irrigated field” and *tarbaša* = “courtyard, study hall”: the tension between an architectural form and something associated with one or another aspect of productive farming seems very relevant to the problem of interpreting Arshama’s *trbš*. Interestingly Jastrow’s version of the first meaning is “garden *near a house*” (my italics).

<sup>210</sup> In the text discussed by Glanville it denotes the entrance into the actual house from the courtyard (not the entrance into the courtyard from the street).

<sup>211</sup> <http://www.achemenet.com/pdf/arameens/lydie01.pdf>

<sup>212</sup> Lindenberger, however, turns “bring them to my *trbš*” into simply “attach them to my service”, which captures the sense but not the meaning of the phrase.

<sup>213</sup> Royal inscriptions: DB §§32-33. Greek: Hdt. 3.117,119,120,140, Xen.Cyr. 2.4.4, 7.5.85, 8.1.4,6,8,17,19,33, 8.3.1,3,13, 8.6.10, 8.8.13; An.1.9.3, 2.1.8, 2.5.31, Dem.10.34, Theop.115F124, Plut.Them.26,29, Diod.9.31, 14.25. Akkadian: VS 6.128, VA 6.185 with BM 120024 (Jursa & Stolper 2007, 261-262), PBS 2.1 105,133, YOS 3.46, BE 10.84,128, Nbk.183, Ner.55 (cf. Van Driel 1993,

If *trbš* could be understood to mean “porch”, this is not perhaps linguistically impossible. (And compare the later *rb trbš* below.) But we are not dealing with satrapal business as such and, although we should not assume satrapal and personal business were hermetically sealed (and this very letter has the sort of subscript also bureaucratically appropriate to “state” business), we should also not too readily assume they were simply undistinguished.

Hoftijzer-Jongeling 1995 s.v. take Arshama to be referring to a specific building where slaves/workers were lodged (the precise physical nature of which perhaps remains uncertain) and then, on that basis, suggest that in the Lydian text *trbš* is a metonymy for slave-personnel, i.e. the people who live in a *trbš*. (A similar idea already appears in Grelot 1972, 314, though without reference to the Lydian text.)

An alternative view might be that in both texts *trbš* represents the enterprise of which the slaves – but also other people and resources – are part: the translation “farm” might capture this, since it can be both a physical place and an economic entity. Arshama would be saying the new recruits should be brought to his farm (that is: to one or another specific place within the farming operations in Nakhtor’s area of activity – we need not assume there was only one locale), tattooed/branded, and registered as estate-property. In the Lydian text *trbš byt* captures the economic and domestic aspects of the man’s property (viewed as real estate and assumed to have an agricultural component), *qny* (cf. BA *qn’* = acquire) are moveable acquisitions, “earth and water” metaphorically represent the bases of subsistence, and (the afterthought) “inheritance” (cf. *y<sup>ε</sup>ret* = “inherit”) focuses on receipt and transmission. Hoftijzer-Jongeling adduce in favour of their understanding the title *rb trbš* in KAI 276, a Sasanid era text in which it is effectively equated with *epitropos* and (perhaps inaccurately<sup>214</sup>) *bḥš* = *pitiaxou*. The reference is, in any case, to the *rb trbš* of a king, so it is not *directly* relevant to the Egyptian and Lydian cases; and insofar as it has an indirect bearing (e.g. in view of the fact that *epitropos* can denote an estate-manager) it does not support one view rather than the other.

On the alternative view, then, *trbš* does function rather like “Gate(s)” – an architectural feature standing *pars pro toto* for a larger architectural feature and metonymically for an institution associable with that larger feature – but in a different sphere. The analogy with *aulē* (see above) is to be recalled.

line 7 *wštrw bšnt’ zyly*, “mark them with my brand”. The practice of marking the bodies of slaves or the like is well-paralleled and perhaps essentially unremarkable. But there are some questions to broach here.

First, there is the choice to be made between branding and tattooing: Driver favoured the former, Grelot the latter, Lindenberger is non-committal (“my mark”). Jones 1987 made a case for widespread use of tattooing in the Greco-Roman world. What should we suppose Nakhtor was meant to have done?

- Egyptian Aramaic texts give no very clear steer: the references to slaves marked with *l* and the owner’s name (B2.11, B3.6; cf. B5.6) perhaps postulate a verbal mark that is insufficiently complex to rule out a branding iron. The temptation to think differently of *ktb* (“write”, “something written”) in D7.9 may be unjustified.<sup>215</sup> The text written

---

241), YOS 17.316,318, GCCI 2.383, YBC 9123, BOR 4.132, CT 22.201. More generally for Akkadian references to the palace gate in the context of officials or official functions cf. CAD s.v. *bābu* A1b2'. (Something similar happens with temples and cities: *ibid.* 1c4', 1d3'.) Hebrew *Esther* 2.19,21, 3.2,3, 4.2,6, 5.9,13, 6.10. Aramaic: TADAE C1.1:1.19,2.17,23, 3.44, D6.7 (a fragment from the Bodleian collection), ADAB A1:7.

<sup>214</sup> Frye 1956. *Bḥš* is the word Altheim-Stiehl 1963, 83-5 linked through *epitropos* to Herodotus’ Patizeithes (*epitropos* of the royal house).

<sup>215</sup> cf. also Isaiah 44.5, KAI 233:12.

on the woman “inscribed in Egyptian” (who turned up in Sippar in 484 and is known from a Babylonian text: NBC 6156, Stolper 1997) is of unknown content and complexity. Pharaonic evidence of (much) earlier date seems to offer examples both of branding and tattooing.<sup>216</sup> *Kharaktêr* and *kharassesthai* in Ptolemaic contexts (P.Hibeh 198: 86-7; III Macc.2.9) are taken by Jones 1987 to refer to branding; but UPZ 121.8 = P.Paris 10 (*estigmenos ton dexion karpon grammasi barbarikois dusin*) is perhaps a case of tattooing. The nature of the mark (*rwšm/ršm*) mentioned in WDSP 2.1 (Gropp) = 2.2 (Dušek) is not intrinsically clear, though the (cognate) words in Hebrew, Judaeen Aramaic, Babylonian Aramaic and Syriac are apt to entail wounds or incisions may slightly favour a brand.

- The talk of *šimtu parzilli* or the like in several Babylonian texts entails actual branding-irons (GCCl 2.194, YOS 6.11,150, YOS 7.128, TEBR 37:14) and may tell in favour of marks described with *šimtu* and its cognates as brands (e.g. YOS 3.125, 6.14, 7.13, Cyr.307,312, BM 25098; see Stolper 1997, 136 n.12). Inasmuch as there are apparently often figurative marks – a star, for example (YOS 6.79/80, 129, 224, Arnaud 1973) or a spade and stylus (BE 8.106) – that is plausible, and WHM 1536 (in Pearce 1996) may refer to the actual star-shaped branding tool. The association of *šendu* with marking of animals – where branding is the presumed method – should also be noted (CAD Š/2 288; BM 94789 = Waerzeggers 2010, no.169). At the same time, some have insisted that, since *šindu* can mean “paint”, tattooing is or, at any rate can be, involved (San Niccolò & Ungnad 1935, 100).<sup>217</sup> The quite frequent texts that use the word *šaṭratu* and talk about writing on the body in Aramaic or Akkadian letters (YOS 6.163, AnOr 8.74, Camb.143, Dar.492, BM 64240) bring us back to the uncertainty of how long a text would have to be to be not plausibly the product of a branding iron: in particular, where does the name of the owner (e.g. PBS 2/1 65,113, UET 4.24, YOS 6.129, Fort.11786 = Stolper 1984) stand in this regard? If the Akkadian words *šindu* and *šaṭratu* have any bearing on the Aramaic phraseology (which is not certain: see below) they perhaps tend to pull us in opposite directions on the branding/tattooing issue (see below).
- Herodotus uses the word *stizein* (*prima facie* = tattoo) in certain Persian contexts (5.35, 7.35, 7.233), of which only the last is entirely straightforward as a story. Taken together they do seem to entail the belief that Persians might tattoo slaves or delinquents (and the some such tattoos might be “royal”). People disagree as to whether this is also presumed in Curtius 5.5.6 (*inustis barbararum litterarum notis*), assuming Curtius has not just used historically incorrect terminology, and the detail is irritatingly absent in the parallel narratives in Diod.17.69.3-4, Just.11.14.11. (For all three sources the amputation of noses, ears and limbs is of much more interest as a sign of Persian brutality.)

It cannot be said that a clear conclusion emerges from these data. We have opted for branding in our translation without complete confidence.

Second, there is a linguistic issue. The words *wšṭrw bšnt* have a decent number of parallels in Egyptian Aramaic texts, either as a pair (in texts from Saqqara: B8.2:3-4, B8.3,

<sup>216</sup> Medinet Habu I pl.42 = Nelson & Hoelscher 1929, 34-35, with fig.25 shows functionaries using a tattooing pen on the shoulders of prisoners (cf. Menu 2005, 340-341), and the Petrie Museum has what may be examples of such a tool (Booth 2001). But various texts (P.Harris 77.5, P.Anastasi V 7(6) = Caminos 1954, 230-1, P.Anastasi V 10(1) = Caminos 1954, 232-3, P.Bologna 1094 9.6 = Caminos 1954, 24-26, Abu Simnel Stele of Year 35 [Rameses II] = Brugsch 1876, 36) are usually taken to refer to branding (the presence of a determinative for burning rather points in that direction), though Menu 2005, 340 seems to question this.

<sup>217</sup> Note that *šindu*, *šendu* and *šintu* are phonetic variants of *šimtu*.

B8.6:2, B8.9) or individually (*šnt* in texts from Elephantine [B2.11:4,5, B3.6:3, B3.9:6,7,9] and Saqqara [Saqqara 97a, 164a], *štr* in a text from Saqqara [B5.6:3]), all of which could refer to slaves or the like (at least when one can tell).<sup>218</sup> But, while *šnt* can be readily enough be compared with Akkadian *šimtu/šindu*, the word *štr* does not sit perfectly with the speciously similar Akkadian *šaṭāru*, for two reasons. (1) The shift between *s* and *š* is at first sight worrying. (2) The conjunction of *šnt* <> Akk. *šimtu* and *štr* <> Akk. *šaṭāru* would involve the conjunction of two Akkadian words which, though both associated with body-marking, actually tend not to be used together – or, if used together (e.g. YOS 6.129:6f, Arnaud 1973), are perhaps so used because they refer to two different things (a figurative mark signifying dedication to a divinity; and some sort of written mark involving words). Of these problems the first is perhaps worse than the second (because there need be no reason that the Aramaic usage should match the Akkadian in detail) – and may not be a real problem, since forms of the verb *šaṭāru* are sometimes written with *s*.<sup>219</sup>

Driver’s alternative explanation for *štr* (based on a Syriac word meaning “concidit, dissecuit”) calls in support three Babylonian texts (Camb.290, Dar.492, GCCI 2.194) that use the Akkadian term *uṣṣuru* = “drawn, engraved, incised” (derived from the verb *eṣēru* = “draw”). Stolper believes (rightly I suspect) that the first two refer to ornamental tattooing or scarification (not property marks), and the third, which also has the word *šindu*, may be saying that a blacksmith made a design (“drew”) on a branding iron (*šindu parzilli*). Once again the main problem here is not really that the contexts of use in these three texts are different from that in the Aramaic documents but that the connection between *štr* and *uṣṣuru* is not conspicuously obvious. It would be better, perhaps, to depend solely on the Syriac parallel. But Kaufman 1974, 101 doubts its cogency.<sup>220</sup>

Third, on a more substantive issue, Stolper has speculated that slaves marked as “royal” were generally protected against sale on the open market (as, he takes it, was the case with those marked as a deity’s property). There is no evidence on the point, but it prompts the thought that, if it were so, it might also apply to the marked property of a “son of the house”. The attachment of these new acquisitions to Arshama’s estate may be a more permanent arrangement than the commercial slave transactions in some of the other pertinent evidence. Since they are not (it would seem) commercial transactions that would not be surprising.

line 7 *’bdw ’l byt*, “make (them) over to my estate”. Lindenberger translates this as “put them to work on my estate”. It is not clear to me whether this a deliberate re-interpretation of *’bdw* or just another piece of rather free translation.

line 8 *kn ydy ’yhwh lk*, “thus let it be known to you”. See A6.8:3(n).

line 9 *wmn ’tr ’hrn l’ tb’wn*, “and from elsewhere you should not seek”. Lindenberger’s “and you do not seek out replacements” seems to limit Nakhtḥor’s obligation to making good of any losses, whereas the rest of letter seems to assume that *pqdyn* should be adding extra resources (and Lindenberger himself spells that out in his translation of l.2)

line 9 *tštlwn*, “questioned”. See A6.8:3 n.

<sup>218</sup> The preposition *b* (which recurs in the Saqqara parallels) seems slightly surprising.

<sup>219</sup> See CAD s.v. *šaṭāru* v., 1b1’, 2a4’, 2a7’, 3a3’, 3c, 3d. I am grateful to Stephanie Dalley for drawing this to my attention.

<sup>220</sup> “[*štr*] is related to *setrâ*, “side” < *štr*, and were the derived verb to occur this early it would be spelled with ‘š’.” Babylonian Aramaic has *štr* = “to move aside” (Sokoloff 2002, 799).

line 9 *gst ptgm*, “severe sentence”. An Iranian phrase which recurs in A6.8:3 in an exactly similar context. See 6.8:3 n.

line 10 *'Rthy...spr*’, “Artahaya... scribe”. See Appendix 1.

line 10 *'Rthy*, “Artahaya”. Tavernier 2007, 305 reconstructs this as \**Rtaxaya-* (compare Elamite Irdakaia and Greek Artakhaies), a two-term hypocoristic of \**Artaxšaça-* or \**Rtaxraθ/tu-*. This name recurs in the Bodleian letters as that of the writer of A6.16, but it is quite distinct from \**Rtāvahyā-*, the Iranian original of *'Rtwy* (Tavernier 2007, 303), the name that appears in letter-subscripts at A6.11:6, A6.12:3 and A6.13:5 in exactly the same way that *'Rthy*/\**Rtaxaya-* appears in the present letter (i.e. as the one who “knows this order”). On the face of it, therefore, we have two individuals, one attested as subscript-official and letter writer (\**Rtaxaya-*), the other just as subscript-official (\**Rtāvahyā-*). To complicate things further we encounter the phrase “*3rty* knows this order” in Demotic in S.H5-DP434 *verso* col.2:3 (Smith & Martin 2010, no.4): this is not formally in the subscript of a document, but it is apparently part of a citation by Arshama of one of his earlier orders and must be evidence that *3rty* could have figured in such a subscript. *3rty* can be reconstructed as \**Rtaya-*, a *-ya-* hypocoristic of a retrenchment of an \**Rta-* name (Tavernier 2007, 306) that is attested elsewhere in Elamite (Irdaia/Irdeia) and Aramaic (*'Rty*). So now we have *three* people with similar names (\**Rtaxaya-*, \**Rtāvahyā-*, \**Rtaya-*) active in exactly the same role in Arshama’s chancellery. Is that too much of a coincidence?

One might be tempted to reduce it to two by equating *3rty*/\**Rtaya-* with one of the others, on the assumption that the demotic scribe has miswritten (by simplification) the name. One could be encouraged in this direction by the fact that *recto* col.1:3 of the same document mentions someone called *3rt*, whom Smith & Martin (followed by Tavernier 2007, 306) take to be the same person: if the scribe can cut *3rty* to *3rt*, perhaps he could already have cut \**Rtaxaya-* or \**Rtāvahyā-* to *3rty*/\**Rtaya-*. But it should be acknowledged that (a) the man in *recto* col.1:3 is described as *hry* (“lord”) which may be a grander designation than is suitable to a subscript-official, (b) *3rt* could represent the distinct name \**Rta-*, attested in Babylonian and Aramaic (Tavernier 2007, 292), and (c) abbreviating *3rty* to *3rt* (i.e. missing out the last letter) is not quite parallel to the reduction of \**Rtaxaya-* or \**Rtāvahyā-* to *3rty*/\**Rtaya-*. So the case remains unclear. If we accept the identity of *3rty*/\**Rtaya-* with (at least) one of the subscript-officials in the Bodleian texts then, since the Demotic document appears to belong to Arshama’s work as satrap, we would have formal evidence that particular subscript-officials could figure in any part of his activities – i.e. that he did not have an entirely separate personal secretariat/administrative entourage for estate-business. But we might be inclined to suspect that anyway. (It is, of course, clear that people named as “knowing this order” did sometimes carry out other functions -- cf. A6.12:1 n. – but that is a different matter.)

As for \**Rtaxaya-* and \**Rtāvahyā-*: the case is not like the two spellings of the name of Artavanta/\**Rtavanta-* (A6.3:1 n.) and we must in general proceed on the assumption that Aramaic scribes knew what they were doing in their renderings of Iranian names. If we felt that, with only five letters with subscripts (all, moreover, with the same scribe), we ought to minimize the number of persons said to “know this order”, we would do better to say that the writer of A6.10 simply made a mistake and wrote down wrong name (\**Rtaxaya-* instead of \**Rtāvahyā-*) rather than that he was using an alternative form of the same name. But we have no real reason to doubt that three different functionaries could be represented in five letters.

line 11 *bMšryn bhtyt*’, “in Egypt, in lower (Egypt)”. A precious more precise indication of Nakhtḥor’s whereabouts (but cf. A6.4:2 n.). The words have normally be translated simply “in Lower Egypt”. But *bhtyt*’ already signifies “in Lower (Egypt)” in itself, and the second *b* would be quite redundant if the phrase were really meant to bear the normally assumed meaning. The

effect is that Nakht̥or is first described as “the *pqyd* who is in Egypt” as in other texts, and a further specification is then added. This rather underlines the formulaic nature of “who is in Egypt”. It is as though it would not have been acceptable in an external address line just to write *bḥtyt*’ -- and it did not occur to the scribe to solve the problem by using an adjective to qualify “Egypt” directly (perhaps because *bḥtyt*’ was also a well entrenched *cliché*).

line 12-13 *’l hndrz’ zy....*, “concerning the instruction which...”. Driver discerned a different external summary (“concerning there being (any) loss from my estate which is in Egypt”) – one that is on the face of it far too long for the number of written marks visible on the Bodleian photograph. Porten-Yardeni’s belief that *hndrz* figures here, as in the external summary to A6.13 (where Driver also saw it), is credible.

line 12 *hndrz*’, “instruction”. From Iranian \**handarza* = “instruction, order” (Tavernier 2007, 408). The word recurs A6.13:3-4,7, A6.14:3, and several Bactrian letters (ADAB A2:1; A4:1; A5:2; A6:6; A6:9), and was evidently a fairly standard word for a satrapal instruction/command -- though in A6.13 and A6.14 it is an order that the satrap or the prince Varuvahya tells someone else (Nakht̥or and others) to issue.

## A6.11 = Driver 8 = Grelot 69 = Lindenberger 42

### Assignment of domain

#### Summary

Arshama authorizes the assignment to Peṭosiri of a domain previously held by Peṭosiri's father.

#### Date

None given.

#### Text

The text is well-preserved, with no problematic *lacunae*. Even the content-summary (here in Demotic) is legible.

line 1 *Knzsrm*, “Kenzasirma”. This individual is also encountered in a similar role in A6.12-14, though he appears as *Kndsyr̄m* and *Hndsyr̄m* in A6.14:1,6, a letter from Varuvahya so certainly not written by one of the scribes responsible for A6.11-13. (He is restored in D6.8, on the grounds that that is a “companion letter to A6.11”: cf. n. below on *nšy byt.*) The name is probably Anatolian (Goetze 1962, 57, Grelot 1972, 476, Tavernier 2007, 527) and perhaps specifically Lycian (Kitchen 1965, postulating \*Kindasarma or \*Kindisarma; cf. Houwink ten Cate 1961, 149-150, Zgusta 1964, 233-234).<sup>221</sup> Driver originally thought the word might be an Iranian title (\**ganzasara-*, lit. “head of treasure”), not a PN, but recanted in the appendix (1965, 100-101).<sup>222</sup> The idea was already criticized by Eilers, 1954-6, 326. If *Knzsrm* (*Kndsyr̄m*, *Hndsyr̄m*) were a title, it would either (a) have to be a second title of Nakhtḥor or (b) represent a second individual only referred to by title. But (a) it does not seem particularly likely that Nakhtḥor had a second title that was only used in address-lines and the idea is in any case excluded by A6.14:1,6 where an “and” appears between “Nakhtḥor” and “*Kndsyr̄m/Hndsyr̄m*”; and (b) the phrase “Nakhtḥor, the treasure-chief(?) and his colleagues” is not readily paralleled.

line 1 *Pṭwsry*, “Peṭosiri”, Egyptian p3-dy+Wsr, “the one whom Osiris gave (DN 298f). Also found in C3.9:13, C3.11:11, C4.2:7, D7.5:8, D7.13:4, D7.39:5, Saqqara 41:7, 92:1, CG 9(= J1), 18, 33, 141?, 228, 240; and in B2.11:4,6,8,10,11,17 (written as *Pṭwsyry*). Two different writings of it appear in lines 3 and 5 of the present document – a surprising instability for a common name? Or something that happens precisely because it *is* common?

line 1 *wršbr* *lym zyly*, “plenipotentiary, my servant”. Note that Peṭosiri is classified as *lym* (and cf. l.5, where *lym* of a potential other recipient of the *bg*) and well as given the title *wršbr*.

line 1 *wršbr*, “plenipotentiary”. See A6.5:2 n. for the various explanations of this title. What relationship is there between Peṭosiri's status as *wršbr* and the petition he makes here? The distinctive ground for the petition is certainly resumption of a property-assignment that had been enjoyed by Peṭosiri's father, Pamun, and lost by him through no fault of his own. Was the father also an *wršbr* and holder of the property on that ground? It would surely have been in Peṭosiri's interest to mention his father's status, so belief that Pamun was a *wršbr* entails belief that the

<sup>221</sup> For another (more certain) case of a Lycian in these letters cf. Armapiya: A6.8:1 n.

<sup>222</sup> The reliably attested title is \**ganzabara-*: cf. A6.13:5 n.

writer of the present letter left it out when reproducing the content of Peṭosiri's message to Arshama – an omission for which there is no obvious cause. One might, of course, say that the fact that the formulation of Arshama's reply fails to identify even Peṭosiri as *wršbr* indicates that the letter-drafter is being careless about titles – but, if so, that is most likely to be because the title did not really matter in relation to the substantive issue, i.e. was not formally relevant to the petition. So perhaps it is safest to assume that Arshama (or his letter-drafter) mentions Peṭosiri's title at the outset as a means of identification -- not least because Peṭosiri was a rather common name – and/or because Peṭosiri used the title of himself in his original petition. From Peṭosiri's point of view, the title may, of course, have been an additional claim on Arshama's good will (even precisely one that his father had *not* had) – though how likely that is does depend on what we do not really know for sure, viz. what the title signified.

line 1 *Pmwn*. i.e. Pamun (pa+'Imn, "he of Amun": DN 350). Also found in one of the fragmentary Bodleian Arshama items (D6.14p:2), conceivably in reference to the same man, as well as in C3.5:7, C3.6:7, C3.12:9, C3.25:8, C4.3:14. Some occurrences of *Pmn* (C4.9:3, D7.5:7, D8.3:16, Saqqara 60:3, CG 42,228) might be writing this name rather than Pamin ("he of Min").

line 2 *ywz'*, "unrest (?)". The term (which recurs in D6.12g) represents Iranian \**yauza-* "revolt, turmoil, rebellion" (Tavernier 2007, 452). Compare Av. *yaoza-* = "excitement" (Yasht 13.95; Lincoln 2012, 131), and more pertinently OP *yaud-* "to be in turmoil", a word used in DSe §5, DNa §4 and XPh §4 of the "commotion" of lands or of the earth to which Darius or Xerxes, with Ahuramazda's assistance, put an end. In DNa this is certainly the situation obtaining at the time of Darius' accession, because it is explicitly Darius' becoming King that puts an end to it. In DSe and XPh the setting is less specific: Darius is simply celebrating the fact that he has ensured that men do not smite one another, that everyone is in his place, and that fear of his *data* prevents the strong from smiting the weak; Xerxes is reporting that, after he became king, there was a land that had to be put back in its right place. (He goes on to speak of a(nother) land where they worshipped *daevas*.) In any event, OP *yauda-* can certainly be associated with major upheavals, and the same could be true of Aramaic *ywz'*: the choice of vocabulary does not require us to downplay the importance of the event. At the same time it probably does not require us to insist that it was an event of great scope. See further A6.7:6 n.

line 2 *bgh*, "domain". See 6.4:2 n. The *bg'* here is designated a *byt* just afterwards in the phrase *byt zr' 30 a(rdab)*.

line 2 *zy hwh mhhsn*, "which he...was occupying (as heir)". Compare Porten-Yardeni's "had been holding-as-heir" and contrast the plainer translations in Driver ("was in possession"), Grelot ("détenait") and Lindenberger ("held"). *Mhhsn* here corresponds precisely to Peṭosiri's request (*'hhsn*) and Arshama's order *yhhsn*. We are dealing with various forms of *hhsn*: viewed as a Haphel of *hsn*, this literally means "cause to be strong" (*hsn* and *hsyn* have various associations with strength or force: cf. Hoftijzer & Jongeling s.v.), but both the simple verb (*hsn*) in *Daniel* 7.18,22 and the Haphel (*hhsn*) in a range of texts from Elephantine, Saqqara, Makkedah, Samaria, Bahardili and Bactria<sup>223</sup> are used to mean

<sup>223</sup> *Elephantine* A5.2:2 (field held by *degel*), A5.5:9 (object unclear: and perhaps we should take the papyrus reading *mhhsn* at face value as meaning "being strong" and exclude the text from the current investigation), A6.2:3 (boat), B2.3:25 (document), B2.9:7 (deposited goods), B2.11:14 (slaves), B7.3:6 (ass). In A4.10:1, B2.3:2, B3.12:5, B4.3:3(?), B7.2:2 individuals are given the quasi-title "*mhhsn* in Elephantine the fortress": the participle has no expressed object. *Saqqara* Saqqara 1:9 (villages), Saqqara 3:5-6 (joint-holding of a *degel*), Saqqara 75a.1 (perhaps *mindh* = tribute/rent; fields

“possess”, where what is being possessed can be a variety of objects. Perhaps “be strong” is taken to imply “be stronger than someone/something else” or “have power over someone/something else”, whence “be in control or in possession of someone/something else”. The reason for the causal force is not very obvious (except in the unusual case of B7.3:6, where *hḥsn* seems to mean “give as a possession”, i.e. cause to possess), but phenomenon is paralleled in Hebrew *ḥzq* (“be strong”) and *hḥzq* (“take”, “keep hold of”), as Muraoka & Porten 2003, 191 n.855 note.

A *prima facie* slightly different use occurs in the Xanthus Trilingual in a troublesome but rather important sentence about *data* = “law” (on which in general cf. Tuplin [forthcoming (c)]). The relevant sentence is *dth zk ktb zy mhḥsn* and has been variously translated.<sup>224</sup> The latest suggestion (Kottsieper 2002a, 210) is “jenes Gesetz ist ein Autorisationsedikt” – a translation based on the view that the sentence literally means “this law is a piece of writing which has provided confirmation” and thus exemplifies a straightforward application of the Haphel “cause to be strong”. But one might get a similar eventual effect while sticking closer to the general usage of (*m*)*hḥsn* by understanding “this law is a piece of writing which has taken possession”, i.e. taken control (of the situation).<sup>225</sup> In any event, the Xanthus case underlines the relatively broad applicability of (*m*)*hḥsn*: where possession is involved, it is not obvious that the word is intrinsically limited to a particular context of possession.

The situation in A6.11 involves an element of inheritance (father-son) and of abandonment (the estate was abandoned at the violent death of Pamun) – factors that evoke Szubin & Porten 1982, a discussion that sought to establish that *hḥsn* connotes hereditary possession and did so *inter alia* in reference to a document about a once-abandoned house. Questions that arise include the cogency of that hypothesis in relation to the documents that originally gave rise to it (which did *not* include A6.11), its extensibility to other documents, and any wider ramification the word may have in the administrative sphere. The hypothesis depends heavily upon two things: (i) a view of the rhetoric of the final documents in the mini-dossiers relating to two pieces of real estate (B2.3, B3.12), viz. that the central figure Maseiah calls himself *mhḥsn* to insist on an entitlement to possession (and an ability to transmit that possession to an heir) for which there was no proper documentary paper-trail; and crucially (ii) lexicographic arguments drawn from outside imperial Aramaic (texts in the Bible and Targum). By contrast the concept of hereditary ownership does not seem a *necessary* postulate in other Egyptian (or indeed non-Egyptian) Aramaic documents in which the verb appears.

---

are mentioned in next line). Saqqara 4.7, 10a.2, 151.2, 169 are too fragmentary for assessment. *Makkedah* EN 199, with *mhḥsn* restored as in Lemaire 2000, 143 n.64 and 2002, 228 (a debt). *Samaria* WDSP 3:4 (slave), WDSP 6:6, 7:9 (*štr* = contract). *Bahardili* KAI 278 = Gibson 1975, 36: city (possessed by Cybebe). *Bactria* ADAB A7 (leather, *perhaps* in the possession of *hyl*; the editors perhaps rather fancifully think of the use of inflated skins as a means of crossing rivers). -- [*yhh*]*snw* is also restored in the fragmentary Bodleian item D6.14 fr.(n), but this casts no independent light on anything.

<sup>224</sup> Dupont-Sommer 1979, 137: ‘cette loi-ci, il (l)’a inscrite, (lui) qui est maître (de la décision)’. (Dupont-Sommer originally thought the sentence meant ‘cette loi-ci, il l’a inscrite pour qu’on la garde’, though he later withdrew this.) Lemaire 1995: ‘the property-holder has written this law’. This seems substantively unlikely if the subject of the sentence is taken to be the priest Simias, who was hardly in a position to write *data*. (Lemaire 2000 allows for the possibility that Simias has caused the *data* to be written, which mitigates but does not eliminate the problem.) Teixidor 1978, 184: ‘This edict (hereby) inscribed is the one that conveys the title of property’.

<sup>225</sup> This resembles Dupont-Sommer’s translation (previous note) but applies “maître” to the *data*, not the writer of the inscription.

Grelot (1974, 92, 184) and others have thought the term *mh̄sn* could (at Elephantine) denote a military *colonus*:<sup>226</sup> the idea is that the term occurs in the records of members of the Jewish garrison because it was structurally characteristic of a garrison community – a type of holding proper to people who are getting land in return for service.<sup>227</sup> In this regard the recurrence of the term in connection with a boat whose repair at state-expense is the subject in A6.2 attracts attention. The *mh̄sn* in A6.2 are the current holders of something, viz. a boat, that *belongs* to someone else (the state). Inheritance is certainly not *prima facie* an issue here; rather (one might assume) the holders have beneficial use of the boat (i.e. access to the income it could provide them) in return for some obligation to the Persian administration – perhaps precisely to put the boat and themselves at its disposal when required.<sup>228</sup> Pamun and Peṭosiri are arguably in a broadly similar situation in A6.11. Arshama bestows the land but would have been entirely free not to do so (Pamun’s holding has conferred no *right* of inheritance upon Peṭosiri) and the property owes *hlk’* – *prima facie* the Aramaic equivalent of Akkadian *ilku* (see below), which was in origin and essence a service tax. What might seem to distinguish the case is that the *hlk’* is owed to Arshama’s estate, not to the state (or e.g. the King’s House). But, given what we know from Babylonia of the way in which land owing a service obligation could be embedded in large Persian-owned estates that are then the channel for payment of incumbent taxes, this may not be as much of a distinction as it looks. This does not make Peṭosiri a military *colonus*, of course, merely the holder of a land-allocation that has a particular fiscal character. Nor do we have to assume that, because the state had to arrange and pay for the fabric of the boat in A6.2, Arshama was responsible for infrastructure expenses associated with the land held by Pamun and Peṭosiri (tools? buildings?). To draw such a close parallel might be to beg questions.

This is all speculative. But I doubt that any persuasive rhetoric on Maseiah’s part is wrongly inducing us to take *mh̄sn* as a technical term when it was never anything of the sort and, if the verb (when used of possessions) *does* have a special overtone, it is more likely to be to do with the administrative context of property-holding than the application of the hereditary principle.

line 2 *byt zry’* 30, “a seed-place of 30 *a(rdab)*”. Porten-Yardeni’s “of 30 ardab seed capacity” accentuates the literal meaning of *zry’* (“seed”) and associates it closely with the figure 30 ardabs (so too Ginsberg 1969, 633 and Naveh 1985, 115). By contrast “a farm of 30 ardabs” (Driver), “une ferme de 30 ardabes” (Grelot), “a 30 ardab plantation” (Lindenberger) all treat *byt zry’* as a composite term (Driver supplies some Targum Aramaic evidence<sup>229</sup>), to which the measurement “30 ardabs” is then attached. Our translation tries to be non-committal. There is in any event an issue about the meaning of the phrase.

<sup>226</sup> Cases where the subject of *h̄sn* is a *degel* (and the object a field [A5.2:2] or “joint-holding” [Saqqara 3:5-6, with Tavernier 2007, 443]) may give further colour to this. On the other hand, the possibility that soldiers hold something made of leather (*hyl mšk’ zy mh̄sn*) in ADAB 7:1 (Naveh & Shaked 2012, 118 speculate rather optimistically about inflated leather bags used for crossing rivers) contributes little or nothing.

<sup>227</sup> That *h̄sn* might connote less than full ownership is not inconsistent with the implications of B2.9:7 (where it involves more than non-beneficial holding of something for temporary protection). At the same time there is no guarantee that *h̄sn* always connotes less than complete ownership.

<sup>228</sup> For what may be a different model of boat management (but one involving Iranian owners) cf. A3.10, with Briant 2002, 607.

<sup>229</sup> Contrast, however, the examples of *byt zr’* in phrases referring to seed requirement in DJD 2.30.2 and ATTM 322 (cited in Hoftijzer & Jongeling). Kaufman 1974, 44 is undecided about whether *byt zry* might be borrowed from Akkadian *bīt zēru*.

Is the measurement one of produce or of seed requirement? Tel el-Far'ah 1 = Naveh 1985, 114-116 (land-lots requiring 3 and 35 *kor* of seed), *Leviticus* 27.16 (the assessment of a land-holding is to be according to its seed requirement), *Isaiah* 5.10 (10 acres of vineyard will yield but one *bath*, a *homer* of seed will yield [only] an *ephah*), ATTM 322, DJD ii 30.2 (both describing land measured in seed-requirement terms), Sardis VII.1.1 I:15-16, SIG<sup>3</sup> 302 (discussed in Thoneman 2009) and abundant Akkadian evidence (CAD s.v. *bītu* 5 and s.v. *zēru* 2) all illustrate and tell in favour of the latter option. But one can also test the issue by asking what each possibility would imply about the size of the estate.

Answering that question entails considering the size of an *artaba*. The *artaba* is encountered in various places and forms.

- Persepolis. A figure of 29.1 litres (30 QA @ 0.97) is widely assumed (Hinz & Koch 1987, 11; Wiesehöfer 1996, 69; Henkelman 2010, 667).<sup>230</sup> Archaeological evidence led Schmidt (1956, 108-109) to suggest that the QA lay in the range 0.9204-0.9499, giving an *artaba* of 27.612-28.497. (The midpoint figures would be 0.9532 and 28.056.) Powell and Van Hour (RLA 7.503) rather pessimistically postulated a 10% margin of error, giving (on the basis of Schmidt's maximum figure) a possible range of 0.85-1 litres and an *artaba* of 25-30 litres. I think one may reasonably think of the Persepolitan *artaba* as roughly 28 or 29 litres (respectively Schmidt's midpoint figure and Hinz & Koch's figure); and for the purpose of what are in any case merely indicative calculations I adopt the latter, since it is the one current in Persepolitan scholarship.
- Herodotus. In his description of Babylonia Herodotus equates an *artaba* (1.192) with 51 *khoinikes*. If this is an Attic *khoinix* and if we are guided by the *kotyle* sizes in the archaeological material collected in Lang & Crosby 1964, 39-55 (viz. 267-300 cc.: p.48) we get figures for a choenix from 1.068 to 1.200 litres (4 *kotylai* = 1 choenix). That makes the Herodotean *artaba* 56.1-61.2 litres, or 1.98-2.16 Persepolitan *artabas*. It is, therefore, tempting to think that he mistakenly made the *artaba* twice as large as it should have been – or, to put it another way was talking about a double-*artabe*.<sup>231</sup>
- Babylonia. The *artaba* is almost invisible in Achaemenid period Babylonia (two texts only appear to be known: Camb.316 and Stolper 2001: no.12) and only slightly more visible in post-Achaemenid Babylonia, where it is confined to a particular archive in Borsippa (Stolper 2006b, 233, 242-3). Its size cannot be independently established in the Achaemenid period texts, and in the Hellenistic ones *ardabu* functions simply as a verbal synonym for Babylonian *mašihu* ("measure"), not as the denomination of a distinct metrological standard. The word may have been more current under Persian rule than now appears from surviving texts, but in the environment from which those texts come there was no systematic introduction of a non-Babylonian *artaba*-standard: it was merely a question of informally using the word *ardabu* in reference to a Babylonian standard. That this might happen reflected (of course) awareness of the existence of the *artaba* as a distinct standard, and that might be indirect evidence for its use in some other environment(s) in Babylonia. The upshot is that in Achaemenid Babylonia, depending on context, one might have encountered a genuine *artaba* (which we can only rationally identify as the Persepolitan one) and a pseudo-*artaba* (a weight that was *ardabu* by name but not in reality). We lack good evidence that the

<sup>230</sup> Pommerening 2005, 163 n.325 attributes this figure to Hallock 1969, 72-74, but it does not seem to appear there.

<sup>231</sup> That view (expressed by Hinz 1961, 237, and endorsed by Pommerening 2005, 164) was rejected by Porten 1968, 71 because he assessed the Persepolitan and Herodotean *artabas* as (respectively) 30 and 51 quarts, giving a ration of only 1:1.7.

incidence of either phenomenon was great but, since we entirely lack *Persian* archives from Babylonia, we have no way of knowing that the *artaba* was not common in official circles.

- Achaemenid Egypt. Outside A6.11, the *'rdb* is encountered in the Jews' offer of a bribe of 1000 *ardabs* of barley (A4.10), a contract between two Jews and an Egyptian from Tahpanes (Daphnae) about grain and lentils to be brought to Syene and distributed at the King's Storehouse (B4.3//B4.4), various disbursement or account lists (C3.14, C3.18, C3.25-28, perhaps D1.34), and a couple of private letters (D7.8, D7.50). All clearly belong within the ambit of the Syene-Elephantine garrison. The *'rdb* is divided into *grīw* and *hpn*, but its size is not, of course, immediately apparent from these documents. There is no direct evidence of *artabas* in non-Aramaic textual material from pre-Hellenistic Egypt. (Malinine's claim to the contrary has been abandoned.<sup>232</sup>)
- Ptolemaic Egypt. There seem to be a bewildering range of *artabai* (Vleeming 1980, Vleeming 1981, Pommerening 2005, 164-173), variously figured as of 48, 60 or 64 *hin* or 28, 29, 30 or 40 *choinikes*, and variously interpreted by modern students of Hellenistic and Roman Egypt. (The problem is that there is no text that states an equivalence between *hin-artabai* and *choinix-artabai*, the size of the *choinix* is not independently known, and any belief that the *hin* remained at its traditional size – which is anyway variously computed -- comes under pressure.)
- Hellenistic Lydia. The Mnesimachus inscription (Sardis VII.1.1) refers to *paradeisoi* and house-plots (*oikopeda*) annotated as *sporou artabon* plus a numeral (3 or 15). This is *prima facie* exactly parallel to the description in A6.11; and it is noteworthy that the terminology is associated precisely with a distinctively Persian type of land (the *paradeisos*). The document establishes nothing about the size of the *artaba*.

(1) We have direct evidence from Persian period sources (Persepolis documents and, once an error is corrected, Herodotus) about the size of a Persian *artaba*. We know that that measure was used in Persepolis. That it was used anywhere else is something that is not known but must be guessed or proved. Herodotus' association of a mistakenly doubled version with Babylonia hardly counts as proof of its use there. But informal seepage of the term into some Babylonian discourse might constitute indirect evidence for the presence of the (presumably) Persian *artaba* somewhere in the picture. (2) We have direct evidence of the *use* of an *artaba* in Achaemenid Egypt: in that respect Egypt differs from Babylonia, though the fact that the Egyptian evidence centres round an official environment corresponds with what we might guess about the *artaba* in Babylonia. We also have abundant indirect post-Achaemenid evidence for the presence of the *artaba* in Achaemenid Egypt, in the shape of the fact that something called an *artaba* was in common use in Ptolemaic and Roman times. In this respect also Egypt differs from Babylonia. It is this indirect evidence that may cast a specifically Egyptian light on the size of the Persian-period Egyptian *artaba*. One type of post-Achaemenid *artaba* (the 60 *hin* one, with the *hin* reckoned at around 0.48 litres) can be made to correspond to the Persepolitan *artaba*. The question is whether the existence of *other*

---

<sup>232</sup> Malinine 1950 found a reference to a 40-*hin artaba* in P.Strasb.4:2 (35 Darius) and P.Louvre E9293 (24 Darius). Moreover, although 40 *hin* should be an *oipe*, the conjunction of P.Louvre E7846 and E7849 with P.Berlin 13614 was supposed to show that this Persian era *artaba* was equated with a *khar* (sack) – which involved a devaluation of the *khar*. But all of this has been superseded. The current view is that the *artaba* is not mentioned in Egyptian language texts before the Ptolemaic era, and that non-Aramaic Egyptians continued to use the *oipe* = 40 *hin* = c.20 litre as their basic measure. See Černý & Parker 1971, Cruz-Uribe 1990, Brinker, Muhs & Vleeming 2005, 805-808, Pommerening 2005, 158-164.

types of which this is not true requires us to postulate the use of a non-Persepolitan *artaba* in pre-Hellenistic (and specifically fifth century) Egypt.

The Babylonian situation illustrates the possibility of a Persian metrological term being applied to a non-Persian measure, but the facts that (a) this only certainly happens in post-Hellenistic texts, (b) the *ardabu* has only very limited impact in such texts (which makes the Babylonian and Egyptian data-sets very different in character) and (c) we cannot securely quantify the measure in question mean that the impact of Babylon on our treatment of Egypt is limited. For the question we confront is not whether people might sometimes informally have used the term *artaba* when measuring things according to some established Egyptian scale that differed from the Persepolitan *artaba*, but whether such a substitution would occur in the environments represented by Elephantine documents – reflecting the processes of the Royal Storehouse -- and land-allocations within Arshama's estate. If we choose to believe this (despite the fact that local arguments from analogy are not encouraging<sup>233</sup>), we have to believe that the substitution occurred rather systematically, in effect that the term *artaba* was officially attached to a quantity substantially different from that of a Persepolitan *artabe*.<sup>234</sup> The only rational way to identify such a quantity would be by assuming it to be represented by one of the (other) *artabai* in the Hellenistic and Roman record. But, of course, as has already been intimated, the question of the size(s) of Ptolemaic *artabai* is a matter of great complexity. Perusal of Vleeming 1981 (especially if taken with the treatment of the Ptolemaic material in Shelton 1977) might leave one feeling able to postulate the currency in Achaemenid Egypt of (a) something like the Persepolitan *artaba* and (b) an equivalent of the undoubtedly common nominal 40-*choinix artaba* which, with any version of the *choinix* on offer would be at least 15% and perhaps as much as 35-40% larger. Pommerening's calculations (2005, 164-173) make things look much more complicated because they are so elaborate. But our only interest in the matter (which, to reiterate, is as a way of knowing what sort of interpretations to put on Pamun's 30 *artaba* land-holding) remains whether her results presupposes the currency in Egypt in pre-Hellenistic times of an *artaba* significantly different in size from the Persepolitan one. The only points at which such a thing shows up in Pommerening's table of results are in the shape of (i) a 22.70 litre *artaba* (representing either 48 *hin* @ 0.473 litres or 50 *hin* @ 0.458 litres) and (ii) a "large" *artaba* of 35.14-37.84 litres (representing 80 *hin* at various different sizes). It is not immediately clear how incumbent it is upon us to believe that either of these were actually current in Achaemenid times (by the concluding part of her discussion that is not Pommerening's concern), but (if either was) it is surely more likely to have been the "large" *artaba* (which represented an accommodation of

---

<sup>233</sup> The Persian *karsha* (83.3 g) entered Egypt in its own right, not as a name to be applied to an Egyptian weight. On Porten's view attention was sometimes actually drawn to the difference between the *karsha* and Egyptian weights by a special annotation (1968, 305-307). On Vargyas' view (2009) the annotation meant something unrelated, but the *karsha* and the *kite* nonetheless remained quite separate.

<sup>234</sup> Briant (2002, 414, 935) was prepared to envisage this, suggesting that, by figuring tax demands in *artabas* that were really tied to the Egyptian "sack", the Persians could raise taxation levels without appearing to do so. But the mechanics of this are not entirely clear (and he was under the influence of Malinine's discredited treatment). A pharaonic tax liability of x "sacks" re-expressed as x *artabas* would bring in *less* (on any credible figure for the Persian *artaba* available to us) and exactly the same (if a "sack" was simply renamed an *artaba*). A trick of this sort could have been tried by the Ptolemies. If the Persepolitan *artaba* was in established use in pre-Hellenistic Egypt, redefining the *artaba* as 30 or 40 *khoinikes* (something that rulers arriving from a Greek environment might do) *would* increase the income represented by a historical tax demand expressed in *artabas*. The fact that the *artaba* was persistently important in post-Achaemenid Egypt in a way that it was not elsewhere surely demonstrates that it was deliberately retained.

the nominal *artaba* to the Egyptian tradition of measuring in a 40-hin unit [the *oipe*] and a 160-hin unit [the “sack”]) than the 22.70 litres *artaba* which seems by contrast to be much more to do with the Greek choinix – and this does seem to be Pommerening’s position earlier in her discussion (2005, 162-163). (It is also not in the end very different from the impression created by Vleeming’s treatment.)

The upshot is that, in assessing Pamun’s landholding, figures generated by using the Persepolitan *artaba* are the minimum, those using Pommerening’s 37.84 litre figure a maximum.

If the 30 *artaba* figure is a statement of produce, the land produced either 873 litres or 1135.2 litres. On the bottom-level Persepolis ration-scale of 1 *artaba* per month those figures represent a single person’s ration for either 29 months or 38 months. On the ration-scales attested in C3.14 at Elephantine of 1, 1.5 and 2.5 *artabas* per month (cf. Porten 1968, 72,81), 30 *artabas* would last 30, 20 or 12 months. (The equivalence of the results for the basic 1 unit ration – 1 QA p.d. / 1 *artaba* p.m. -- may actually be a hint that the *artaba* in question in Egypt is the Persepolitan one after all.) But Peṭosiri would presumably be supporting more than just himself, which makes such figures only a starting point – and leaves one wondering whether the land would be adequate for a family and household personnel, especially given the possibility that an *wršbr* (whatever one was) would be entitled to more than rock-bottom provision.

If, on the other hand, the 30 *artaba* figure is a statement of seed requirement the calculations are rather different. Now the question is how much seed is required for a given area of land and how many people a piece of land requiring 30 *artabas* might support. These are tricky things to tie down. Schnebel 1925, 125-126 suggests a rate of 1 *artaba* per *aroura* as a norm, though the actual attested figures he is working with vary rather considerably either side of that (from 0.54 to 1.29 *artabas*), and Vleeming 1981 cited him as giving 1.0-1.5 or 1.2-1.3 *artabas* per *aroura* as a guideline figure (which is a hint at how disturbingly flexible these data can seem to be). Nor does Schnebel seem to define which *artaba* he assumes to be involved. Still, if one ignores that question and takes the 1 *artaba* per *aroura* figure, Peṭosiri’s land would be 8.25 hectares in area (an *aroura* being 0.275 ha). The discussion in Thoneman 2009 (not conducted on the basis of Egyptian material) suggests a seed figure of 170 litres per hectare and, if one computes that in terms of Persepolitan and Egypto-Persian *artabas*, one gets figures of roughly 5 or 6.7 ha. Beyer (commenting on ATTM 322) quotes an estimate equivalent to 150 litres per hectare, producing plots of roughly 5.7 or 7.6 ha. What all these calculations have in common (apart from their rather uncertain basis and *ad hoc* character) is that the plot-sizes they produce should be viable for Peṭosiri the *wršbr* and his household.<sup>235</sup> This tends to confirm that one should understand “30 *artabas*” as indicating seed requirement, not output.

line 2 *'štbq bgw*, “was abandoned within (Egypt)”. This translation follows Whitehead’s suggestion that *bgw* (literally “within”) means “in (Egypt)”, and is an annotation added because Arshama was not in Egypt at the time. His ground for saying this is that the logical antecedent of the word *bgw* is “Egypt” (in the phrase “when there was unrest in Egypt...”). But, even if that be so, it is not entirely clear that anything follows about Arshama’s whereabouts, since this part of the letter is actually quoting Pamun’s message to Arshama. (When the substance of that message is repeated in Arshama’s voice in A6.11:4-5, prefacing

---

<sup>235</sup> For local comparison Egyptian *makhimoi* reportedly got a 3 ha plot (Hdt.2.168). See Gallant 1991, 84,87, Moreno 2007, 61.

a statement of his decision on the matter, *bgw* is absent.)<sup>236</sup> Driver translates it as “then”, explaining it in his note as short for *bgwh* = “within it”, by analogy with Akkadian *ina libbi* for *ina libbišu* “therein, thereupon” (cf. also Whitehead 1974, 255). Ginsberg suggested “in the course of it [sc. the rebellion]”, which is probably what Porten-Yardeni mean by their “therein”. Grelot ignored it, while Hoftijzer-Jongeling 1995, 216 (s.v. *gw<sub>2</sub>*) suggest “and in consequence”.

line 2 *'štbq... 'bdw*, “abandoned...perished”. As presented here the unrest led to the death of Pamun and the household personnel – and then to nothing: the land was neither reclaimed nor reassigned by Arshama nor seized by the people responsible for the disorder; and there is no suggestion that it was significantly damaged. Is this perhaps surprising? It would not appreciably ease the problem if *'bdw* were taken to mean “were lost” (e.g. because seized by someone else) rather than killed. But line 4 (Pamun “perished with the people of his household”) probably tells against that reading. In Babylonia we encounter the idea of unassigned bow-fiefs in various Murashu texts (see Stolper 2001, 98; add PBS 2/1 217), YBC 11564 (Stolper 2001, 97 no.7) and Bellino 1 (Stolper 2004, 533). Stolper 2001, 98 draws attention to the analogy with the present case. Whether those cases were the result of violent disturbances we cannot readily tell (though they certainly do not all post-date the upheavals of 424-423 BC).

line 2 *nšy byt'*, “people of our household”. This corresponds to Akkadian *nišē bīti* (Ginsberg 1969, 633 n.4, Kaufman 1974, 78, Muraoka & Porten 2003, 350). See CAD s.v. *nišū* (3a) p.287-8, where the phrase is translated “retainers”. (*Nišū* can also denote *glebae ascripti* and family-members.) The Aramaic phrase is applied to people associated with Hinzani in A6.12, and appears a couple of times in the battered remnants of D6.8, (presumably) contributing to Porten-Yardeni’s view that that is a companion letter to the present text.<sup>237</sup> (In D6.8 they belong to whoever is addressing Arshama: i.e. here as in A6.11-12 the term does not describe anyone who is part of Arshama’s household / estate.) But in A4.7 = A4.8 *nšy* by itself apparently = “wives”; and the word *nšn* means “lady, woman” in a series of TADE B and C texts (where it is used as an honorific title attached to the name of an individual woman) and in PFAT 100 and 189 in lists of rations for men, women and children (cf. Azzoni 2007, 261). Consequently Driver and Grelot took *nšy byt'* to signify “women of the house” in the present text. But, although all wives/women might be household personnel, not all household personnel have to be wives/women, and the Driver/Grelot view seems unduly restrictive. “People of our household personnel” is preferable. There is at least a verbal contrast between Arshama’s perception that disorder threatens *grd' wnksy'* (A6.10:1 etc.) and Peṭosiri’s that it leads to the destruction of *nšy byt'*. Other terminology for household includes *'nwšh* in D8.4:24 (“household” [Porten-Yardeni, Porten & Lund]), *'nsth* (“his household” [Porten-Yardeni] or “his people?/wife [Porten & Lund]) in A2.1:14 and A2.4:3,<sup>238</sup> and even *byt'* in A3.2:6 (“household” [Porten-Yardeni]) and perhaps A3.5:6 or A5.1:3 (though in these places Porten-Yardeni have “house”).

line 2-3 *l' yhyb... 'hhsn*, “was not given...let me occupy (it as heir)”. Note the unusually staccato effect of the three requests. And, as Whitehead 1974, 185 observes, there is another very brief sentence in line 5 (“You, notify him”). One might also compare *kn 'bdw kzy ly thdnw* (“thus do that you gladden me”) in A6.14:3-4 or the fairly peremptory *ydy' yhw h lk* (“thus let it be known to you”) in A6.8:3 and A6.10:8 (as well as Bactrian letters and the OT: cf.

<sup>236</sup> For a more probable argument of this sort see *tmh bMšryn* in A6.4:4, with note ad loc. See Introduction 26-30 on the wider question.

<sup>237</sup> The remains of D6.8 include some names that suggest it was no means entirely like A6.11. The relationship of A6.15 and D6.7 looks closer.

<sup>238</sup> Note that *'nš* = “person, someone, individual, mankind”; *'nth* = “woman”.

A6.8:3 n.), though these are more isolated in their immediate contexts. Another curt phrase, *'nrwy 'l t'bdw* (“do not act in contrary manner”), encountered three times in the Bactrian letters (A5:2-3, A6.5, B7.3) is not a feature of Arshama’s epistolary style. The narrative style of Vahuvakhshu, as reported in one of Akhvamazda’s letters to Bagavant (ADAB A1), highlights Bagavant’s failings and his own intervention in brief sentences: “Therefore I inform (sc. my lord). Thereafter Bagavant was interrogated by my lord” (A1:3-4), “I again complained to my lord” (A1:4), “That Bagavant did not wish to release the men. I again complained to my lord” (A1:6). There is *ad hoc* repetition here, but “therefore I inform (sc. my lord)” is perhaps a cliché of report composition (cf. A6:4, “concerning that I inform my lord”), though (again) not one found in the Arshama correspondence. Perusal of TADAE A2-A5 (and cf. also ADAB B1:1-2, B5:8-9) suggests that short sentences are in general more common in non-official letters, partly because they are more prone to be multi-topic and this strains the limitations of space (especially when written on ostraca).

line 3 *hn knm hw*, “if it is thus”. Arshama is effectively inviting the addressees to check the relevant files. But he does not do so explicitly: it is not generally part of the rhetoric of these letters to emphasize the bureaucratic process. (The presence of subscripts, as here in line 6, is a notable exception, but one presumably dictated by need.)

line 3 *Pṭsry*. An abbreviated writing of the name, also found in D22.20. For another oddity see l.5.

lines 4-5 *w'l byt'...l' yhyb*, “to my estate....was not made over”. Peṭosiri had just said that Pamun and the household personnel perished and the domain was abandoned. Arshama’s words effectively attribute to him the further facts that the domain was neither reincorporated in Arshama’s *byt* nor reassigned to another *'lym*; and he adds a condition upon granting the request that Peṭosiri had not articulated, viz. a requirement to pay *hlk*. That Peṭosiri did not mention *hlk* is probably because he takes it as read (it may be implicit in *mhḥsn*: line 3), not because he thinks that by saying nothing he will end up not having to pay it; and the request for grant of the domain does entail the assumption on Peṭosiri’s part that it was and remained truly abandoned. So the additional items in Arshama’s rehearsal of the facts and determination of the issue add nothing unexpected or untoward from Peṭosiri’s point of view. But the drafter of the letter, while adopting the repetitive mode, has not seen fit to make the request literally match the response. (See also 6.7:6-8 n.)

line 5 *'hr*, “then”. See A6.7:6,7 n.

line 5 *Pṭswry*. A metathetic writing of *Pṭwsry*, presumably simply erroneous (Porten 2002, 285). For another metathesis cf. A6.7:2,9 (*Prym*, *Pyrm*).

line 5 *hlk*, “tax”. This designates something the *mhḥsn* must provide to the owner of the estate within which the lease was held. The Aramaic word also appears in

- Ezra 4.13,20 and 7.24. A tax in Transeuphratene (along with *b<sup>e</sup>lo* and *minda*)
- ADAB A1. A complaint is made that Bagavant and his associates had extracted a land-related *hlk* from certain camel-keepers in an improper fashion
- D6.13 fr.d:1 where, according to Porten & Lund 2002, 222, we have *h}lk wmdh*, though TADE IV prints only *.k mndh*. If correct this gives us two (potential) “tax” words together, *hlk* and *mndh* (as also in Ezra), but far too little survives to provide any intelligible context. On *mndh* see A6.13:3 n.

*Hlk* inevitably evokes Akkadian *ilku* (Kaufman 1974, 58), though some worry about the philological niceties of the connection: see variously Henning 1935 and 1958, 41 (for whom the connection is indirect) and Driver 1965, 70 (for whom it does not exist, *hlk* being derived instead from *alāku(m)* = “go, do service”<sup>239</sup>). This is surely unnecessary, since *hlk* actually appears in reference to *ilku* in two Aramaic epigraphs on cuneiform texts (Delaporte 1912, nos.73,78).<sup>240</sup> *Ilku* is a portmanteau term, embracing various sorts of obligation – in Borsippa (for example) transport of the royal food supply, *urašu*-service, “the front of the bow” and (on one occasion) *hišarû*, in the Murašu archive “soldier of the king, flour, *barra*, and the other dues of the royal house”.<sup>241</sup> It is in essence representative of, and even sometimes actualised in, personal service obligations, and the basis of liability – often unclear – can certainly include estate-holding: that is classically the case in the Murashu archive, but also in other contemporary Babylonian contexts. There is certainly a broad analogy between Peṭosiri and people in Mesopotamia.

Whitehead, while offering “pay the land tax” in his translation, in the commentary properly notes that *ilku* could be service, payment in kind or payment in money, and initially glosses line 5 as “Let him...the *ilku* service to my estate”. And perhaps – especially since *hsl* is so opaque (see below) – one *should* not entirely forget the possibility that *hlk* designates something other than cash payment.

The Bactrian text *might* be consistent with service, e.g. making the camel drivers *do* something with their camels. Bagavant took things from the camel-drivers, detained them in prison, and extracted an unwarranted *hlk*. What he took initially is not plainly identified, though later he took some animals (not camels) from them and imposed a “surcharge” (?) (*nhmrnyt*, a putatively Iranian word) “more than on another land (*mt*)”. There is perhaps nothing here that guarantees the *hlk* is monetary: even if the *hlk* was extracted literally while the drivers were detained, there is no guarantee that there were not other people (servants of the drivers) who could have performed some service. (Even if the *hlk* was monetary, payment of it must have involved action by people other than the detainees.)

line 6 *hšl*, “pay”. This word describes the making over of the *hlk* to the estate. In Egypt it appears otherwise in:

- D14.7: “Ezer 1 *hsl* 2”, a reading described as uncollated, uncertain and doubtful.
- CG 156: *’hšl* appears alone in the fragmentary final line of an ostrakon and is rendered “je paierai (la taxe)” for no purely contextually imposed reasons
- CG 200: ]*bt hšl’/h z/i*], rendered “en cette maison d’impôts/en payant une taxe l ?”; again nothing else in the ostrakon necessarily points at a context concerned with tax.

Porten-Yardeni render “pay” (with some doubt), Whitehead 1974, 84 says its meaning remains unclear, which means the nature of the transfer and what is being transferred (i.e. the content of *hlk*) are unclear. Driver sought an explanation in Akkadian *hašālu*, a word for which CAD gives only the meaning “crush”,<sup>242</sup> but which Driver persuaded himself might mean “deliver”. Kaufman 1974, 54-55 was unimpressed and produced a suggestion of his own: *hšl* might be related to a suggested alternative reading of VS 6.188:13 to produce *i-ha-ša-la-* in lieu of (the *hapax*) *i-ha-la-la-*, in a context that also concerns the performance/payment of *ilku ša šarri*. Grelot 1972, 317 thought it probably of Akkadian

<sup>239</sup> *Hlk* = “go, walk” appears in Egypt in B8.3, C1.1:40 (“walking among the vineyards”) and CG 44 (*’hk* = “j’irai”), 204 (*yhk* = “il ira”), J3 (*’yhk* = “j’irai/il ira”), J6 (*yhk* = “qu’il aille/il ira”).

<sup>240</sup> The connection of *hlk* and *ilku* is also assumed by Schwartz 2008.

<sup>241</sup> Borsippa: Joannès 1989 (especially L 4720), Jursa 2009. Murashu archive: Cardascia 1951, 99.

<sup>242</sup> Dupont-Sommer duly contemplated treating *hšl* in CG 200 as something to do with smithying or forging.

origin but failed to specify one (I am unsure that his allusion to Driver entails endorsement). Muraoka & Porten 2003, 348-351 note no putative Akkadian explanation. Hoftijzer 1995 produces nothing.

line 6 *'Rtwhy...spr'* “Artavahya...scribe”. cf. A6.10:10 n. and Appendix 1.

line 7 *hmrkry'*, “accountants”. Iranian *\*hamāarakara* (Tavernier 2007, 424; and cf. 444 for the adjectival *\*hamāarakarnaya* indirectly attested in Saqqara 49:4). The restoration is certain thanks to the parallel annotation in A6.12:4, A6.13:6. Fuller titulature is reserved for the external address as in A6.1. The OP term recurs in Egypt in A6.2 (treasury accountants: see nn.) and D3.28:2 (a mere fragment), at Persepolis (PF 281: an Aramaic annotation) and in Babylonia: Tavernier cites 10 texts, to which add BM 61583 (12/3/28 Darius) in MacGinnis 2006, 95-97.<sup>243</sup> Some Babylonian *\*hamāarakaras* have quite high associations (connected with the royal *bīt mīksu* [ROMCT 2.35] or Artahsar, one-time controller of the *nakkandu šarri* [PBS 2/1 84], or just plain “royal” [BE 10.130]), others are less well-defined (BE 10.59, 80, 82, 97, EE 108, IMT 110, Eilers 1940:56.). In BM 61583 the term applies to three witnesses known elsewhere as scribes in Sippar.<sup>244</sup>

The Bodleian letters in which accountants are mentioned concern assignment of territory within the estate (A6.11), rations for the image-maker Hinzani (A6.12) and the extraction of *mndt'* from the estate of someone other Arshama (A6.13-14) – all contexts about income or disbursement. One could imagine them having a role in the context of estate-enhancement (A6.10) or the return of the Mišpeh Thirteen to work or (certainly) Psamshek's *dšn* (A6.4); but the latter two letters are addressed to Artavanta, so may be seen as belonging at a higher bureaucratic level; and A6.10 is, as formulated, a rather individual reprimand to Nakhtḥor (though, cf. 5 n., other unnamed persons are involved to some degree). Porten 1968, 46 thought the people in the Bodleian letters were public officials who also worked in the private sphere. But private business men had accountants too (as we see in the Murašu archive), and so did queens: Irtašduna orders that a wine-ration be issued from her estate at Kuknaka to Kamšabana the accountant (*muššan zikira*: PF 1837), and Irdabama tells “accountants at Šullakke” to look at the sealed document *in re* a transaction involving a nurseryman and “do the accounting” (PFa 27). A6.11 and A6.12 are consistent with the accountants mentioned therein being officials whose remit is no larger than Arshama's (personal) estate. Nor does their involvement in Varuvahya's problems imply anything different; if Arshama can give Nakhtḥor authority to interfere in someone else's estate, he can do the same for his private accountants. At the same time, it may be unrealistic, when dealing with a figure such as Arshama, to draw sharp private-public distinctions (cf. Fried 2013, 324, 328).

line 8 *Demotic annotation*. Lindenberger omits this from his text (perhaps defensibly in what is primarily an anthology of Aramaic and Hebrew letters) but less defensibly does not even draw attention to it in his notes. (Oddly, in A6.13 he does draw attention to the existence of a Demotic annotation.) This summary provides a brief summary of the document's content (parallel in type to the Aramaic summaries found in A6.4-5, A6.7-8, A6.10, A6.12-13). *šḥ* is a basic and anodyne word for “field”, so there is no attempt to find a Demotic term capturing the particular “domain” status of the land in question. The position of the annotation is noteworthy. It lies above the line containing the (Aramaic) external address, but largely runs

---

<sup>243</sup> *\*Hamāarakara* may also appear in abbreviated Akkadian form as *amura* (OECT 12 C6, with Jursa 2013: 7) and (in the plural) *ammarani* (VS 6.223, with Tolini 2011, 340).

<sup>244</sup> For something of the post-Achaemenid history (Parthian, Sasanian, Syriac, Hebrew, Palestinian Aramaic) of the word cf. Greenfield 1970 and 1977, 115-116.

adjacent to the space left (as usual) between *mn* (“from”) and the addressor’s name (here Arshama) to accommodate the sealing. The same phenomenon occurs with the (briefer and categorically different) annotation in A6.12, where (moreover) the Demotic lettering is actually on the same line as the address, and so sits exactly where one would expect the seal to be placed. In A6.13, by contrast, the Demotic annotation is adjacent to (and slightly overlaps) the Aramaic summary at the extreme left-hand end of the address line.<sup>245</sup> In the first two cases it is rather as though the annotation was added after the sealing had been removed (always assuming that a seal had ever been attached), while in the third it was certainly not added as part of the same process that produced the Aramaic summary. Both observations would suit a moment after the receipt and opening of the letter. On the presence of Demotic annotations see also Appendix 1.

---

<sup>245</sup> Nothing can be said about the precise original location of Demotic name *Ḥtp-b3st.t* or *Ḥtp-is.t* in D6.11 fr.(h).

## A6.12 = Driver 9 = Grelot 70 = Lindenberger 46

### The image-maker Ḫinzani

#### Summary

Arshama authorizes rations for the sculptor Ḫinzani and his household personnel.

#### Date

None given.

#### Text

The principal areas of uncertainty are the name of the subject of the letter (line 1), *bdykrn / brykrn* (line 2), the small lacuna in the middle of line 2. As usual Lindenberger is more conservative in the placing of square brackets and the marking of letters as damaged though reasonably certain.

#### Commissioning of artistic work

In general terms the letter evokes a famous letter of the Kassite king Kadashman-Enlil I [1374-1360] to the pharaoh Amenophis, ordering art works (cf. Kuhrt 1995b, 342-343),<sup>246</sup> not least for its pressing urgency (cf. line 3 here), or a document recording the apprenticing of a slave of Cambyses (before he was king) for four years to learn the art of seal-cutting (Cyr.325: 28 February 530). One might also, for contrast, note IG i<sup>3</sup> 476.158-167, listing artisans, the subject they are making, and the sum paid:

Phyromachos of Cephisia, the young man next to the *thorax*, 60 drachmas. Praxsias who lives in Melite, the horse and the man who shows his back, 120 drachmas. Antiphanes from Kerameis, the chariot and the young man and the horse that is hitched, 240 drachmas (tr. Erietta Bissa)

Root 1979, 23 cites the present letter as presumptive support for the idea of sculptors being brought to the royal court to confer with the King about the planning of imperial commissions.

line 1 *Hnzny*, “Ḫinzani (?)”. The third and fourth letters are rendered uncertain by damage to the parchment. Porten-Yardeni indicate that the name might also theoretically be read as Ḫnhby, Ḫnhpy, Ḫnhny, Ḫnzby or Ḫnzpy. The general favour for Ḫinzani is due to its evocation of the toponym Hinzanu/Hindanu in the middle Euphrates, south of the Habur (RLA IV 415-416, Zadok 1994), since this provides *some* handle on what is otherwise a philologically puzzling name.<sup>247</sup> (Ḫinzani occurs as a gentilic in Dar.379:32.). If this is right, the image-maker is onomastically not Egyptian.

line 1 *ptkrkr*, “sculptor”. Iranian *\*patikarakara-*, “maker of statues” (Tavernier 2007, 429). See below on *ptkr* = *\*patikara-*.

line 1 *zy Bgsrw hyty Šwšn*, “whom Bagasrava brought to Susa”. Note that when Ḫinzani went to Susa he was taken there by one of Arshama’s officials; he does not travel independently.

<sup>246</sup> “There are skilled craftsmen where you are. Let them represent a wild animal, either a land or river creature, lifelike, so that the hide is exactly like that of a live animal. Your envoy shall bring it to me. But if the old ones are ready and available, then, when Shindishugab, my envoy, arrives at your court, let him immediately, posthaste, borrow chariots(?) and get here. Let them make some new ones for future delivery.”

<sup>247</sup> Lindenberger prints *Hnz[n]y*, but comments that name and derivation are uncertain.

Compare the “artisan” (*’mn*) who is in Nakhtḥor’s party in A6.12:4. If Ḥinzani’s name is not Egyptian (see above), there is no absolute necessity to assume that Bagasrava brought him to Susa *from Egypt* just because Egypt is plainly where he now is (since it is Egyptian officials who are to feed him). The fact that Bagasrava appears in letter subscripts (A6.8, A6.9) makes no difference to this: indeed, if the relevant letters were written from somewhere in the heart of the empire – and that is *prima facie* the case with Nakhtḥor’s travel-document (A6.9), though not with A6.8 – Bagasrava need have had no direct association with Egypt at all. It is not immediately obvious why Ḥinzani’s earlier trip to Susa needs to be mentioned, but there was presumably some back-story that was clear to Nakhtḥor. One possibility is that Arshama, who seems to have been in Susa when Ḥinzani came there (*hyty*, lit. “caused to come”, points that way), is (still) there (see below, note on line 3), but that would not entirely resolve all the problems. For, whether or not Ḥinzani was Egyptian and/or had not previously been in Egypt, one wonders why he had been sent there now if Arshama was still in Susa, especially given Arshama’s insistence that Ḥinzani’s new work reach him as soon as possible. The same question would arise even if Arshama were in some third place (perhaps Babylon?), as Root 1979, 23 supposed. Fleischer 1983 inferred that Ḥinzani was to use a raw material only, or best, available in Egypt, and suggested stone of some sort. That would tell against Ḥinzani being a seal-cutter (cf. below, note on lines 2-3), since the requisite precious or semi-precious stone for that purpose was surely as available in Susa or Babylon as anywhere else, but does not necessitate an eventual product as large-scale as the Penelope of which Fleischer speaks elsewhere in his paper (see below, note on line 2). Another possibility is that Arshama, though absent from Egypt at the time of writing (and the time of Ḥinzani’s arrival there) expects to be in Egypt in the relatively near future and wants Ḥinzani to be there precisely because it will make for rapid delivery of his work.

line 1 *Bgsrw*, “Bagasrava”, i.e. Iranian \*Bagasravā (Tavernier 2007, 139). A homonym of the man who “knows this order” in the subscripts to A6.8 and A6.9, and there seems no strong reason to deny their actual identity. On the more problematic case of Artahaya / Artavahya / Artaya cf. A6.10:10 n.

line 1 *Šwšn*, “to Susa”. There is no preposition expressing motion towards a GN, as also happens with Babylon in A6.13:5 (*lhytyh Bb’l*), A6.14:2 (*mhytyn Bb’l*) and A6.14:5 (*y’th ‘ly Bb’l*) and with Egypt in A6.9:2 (*’zl Mšryn*). (These are the only examples of motion towards a named place in the Bodleian letters.) By contrast “in Babylon” in A6.15:5 is *bBb’l*.

line 1 *ptp*, “rations”. See A6.9:2 n. and below, note on line 2.

line 2 *nšy byt’*, “people of his household”. See 6.11:2 n. Since the surviving letters are the final fair copies for actual transmission the words “and to the people of his household” presumably represent something accidentally omitted in copying from a draft rather than an afterthought during dictation. Either way it was substantively important they were included. (Contrast A6.15:1.) One wonders how large a group it was.

line 2 *grd*, “personnel”. See A6.10:1 n. Even leaving aside *bdykrn/brykrn* (next n.), there is no doubt that the sculptor *alias* servant (*’lym*) Hinzani and the “people of his household” are assimilated to the category of *grd*, at least so far as ration-receipt is concerned. But the possible conjunction of *kurtaš*-status and technical skill is plainly evidenced in the Persepolis documentation (Rollinger & Henkelman 2010, 338), and is perhaps implicit in Darius’ account of the building and decoration of Susa (DSf). We should not assume that craftsmen would be

free.<sup>248</sup> \**Gr̥da-lkurtaš* are, of course, ration consumers in Persepolis, the relevant Aramaic word being precisely *ptp.* (Most of the evidence is of course in Elamite.) Association of \**piθfa-* with *grd'* can also be paralleled in Babylonia in (a) VS 3.138/3.139 = BM 42383, where dates are provided for *gardu*, magi and courtiers [*mār ekalli*] of the Bit-hare,<sup>249</sup> and (b) the appearance of officials designated “\**piθfabaga-* in charge of *gardu*” (BE 9.15, PBS 2/1 160; named without title in PBS 2/2 2) or \**piθfabaga-* of *gardu*” (BE 10.95): the first is an agent of a Canal-manager and collects dates from *gardu*-fields; the second collects rents on land belonging to the Crown Prince Estate, acting at the behest of the estates *paqdu* (who is himself associated with a *gardapatu*). The putatively ration-apportioning character of the \**piθfabaga-* might call to mind the standard association of Persepolitan groups of *kurtaš* with a named person who (in Hallock’s rendering) is their apportioner (*šaramanna*) or assigner (*damanna*) (Stolper 1985, 58). A similar comparison has been drawn between these Persepolitan officials and the \**piθfakāna-* attested in Bactria (ADAB C1:47, C4:10,25), one of whom collects rations for *rytky*’ = “servant-boys” (Henkelman 2008, 128). In broad terms the connection is legitimate, but one may wonder whether that the people in Persepolis are not more remote from the day—to-day business than the Babylonian and Bactrian figures. (It might make as much sense to see the Persepolitan \**piθfakāna-* as the officials who make actual allocations (described by the Elamite term *kurmin*): see A6.9:2 n.

line 2 *brykrn zyly* or *bdykrn zyly*, “my stonecutters” or “on my memorandum”. The alternative possible readings have attracted various explanations, though with a understandable preference for producing the meaning “artist”, given that we are in any case dealing with an “image-maker”.

*Brykrn* It is tempting to link this with \**bāryakara-* / \**bārēkara-*, a word also represented in Elamite *barekurraš* or *barekurriš* in PF 865, 866, PFNN 1524 (lists of treasury workers at Shiraz in the first two and unlocated – but possibly Shirazian -- treasury-workers in the third). Hallock rendered the term “attendants”, citing Gershevitch for \**parikara-* (cf. Sanskrit *parikara*),<sup>250</sup> but, in the light of the other people who appear in these texts, it is perhaps a little hard to believe in such an anodyne category.<sup>251</sup> Tavernier 2007, 417 preferred “artisan, artist”, citing

<sup>248</sup> We have evidence of *prisoners* making a statue of Nabonidus in the royal *bit šūtum* (storehouse) of the Ebabbara temple at Sippar (BM 62602; MacGinnis 1995), perhaps the very statue Nabonidus is known to have commissioned in the second year of his reign (Beaulieu 1989, 134-135). (We hear about them, it seems, because they had managed, temporarily, to abscond. Zaccagnini 1983, 247,250 notes the tendency of craftsmen in Mari or Anatolia to do just that.) For deportation of craftsmen cf. II Kings 24.14 (craftsmen and smiths taken from Jerusalem). Cyr.325 (see above) exemplifies a pattern (even if not a widespread one) of craft-skilled slaves earning income for their owners (Zaccagnini 1983, 261, Dandamaev 1984, 298).

<sup>249</sup> Meaning uncertain (CAD s.v. *harû* E). The Concise Akkadian Dictionary suggests a sanctuary. The title *mār ekalli* is extremely rare at this period too: the only other example known to Jursa is in BM 42607 (cf. Jursa 1998b) - which might not be Achaemenid. The *mar ekalli* is mentioned alongside a *rab kāširī* (treasurer), a *rab urâte* (chariot-commander: for the title cf. Murashu often), and a *tupšar ekalli* (scribe of the palace: cf. Dar.198, Wunsch 1993, 214). They are all paying a tithe.

<sup>250</sup> Hinz claimed (1973, 41) this should have given Elamite *barrikurraš*, with two “r”s – presumably (as Elizabeth Tucker points out to me) simply because the Iranian prefix/preverb is regularly transcribed as *barri-* in Elamite.

<sup>251</sup> The categories mentioned (in 856-866) with their ration levels are: keeper of *atna* (Schmuck-Hüter) (6), scribe (4), *etip* (commodity-handling official elsewhere) (4), *tapmikilkira* (??) (4), *barikurraš* (male and female) (4), *kapnuškip* (treasury-worker) (3.5), *ramikurraš* (male and female) (3), handlers of *hazarna* (\**ačarna-*: Möbel, Inventar) (3), *mulatap* (Hausdiener) (3), female chief (*araššara*) (5), female *ammalup* (Ammen, Kindergärtnerinnen) (2), female ration makers (2)

Henning ap. Driver 1965, 72 and Hinz (1975, 64). These earlier discussions actually introduce several different justifications for the translation.

Henning saw a possible connection with Pahl. *brā(h)-* = Persian *b<sup>r</sup>rāh* = “splendour”, giving “maker of splendour”, hence “artist”. Menasce 1954, 162 (cited with approval by Hinz) proposed *either bārīk-kār* = “polisseur (de pierres)” (accepted by Grelot 1972, 318) or a connection with Pahl. *burritan* = Pers. *buridan*, *burridan* = “trancher”. Since *bārīk* apparently just means “nice, pretty”, it seems a bit over-specific to speaking of a “polisher”, but in any event we are being offered a “maker of nice things” or a “cutter”. Hinz 1973, 41 additionally argued that, since the *\*ramyakara* who appear in the Shiraz texts mentioned above could be interpreted as “makers of fine things” (Tavernier 2007, 406, 430: *\*ramya-*, *\*ramikara-*), the *\*bāryakara-* (who get higher rations) might be the “makers of super-fine things”

*Bdykrn* Driver noted Nyberg’s suggestion that *\*bitya-kara* = second workers = assistant, but rejected it on the reasonable ground that one would expect Aramaic *btkyr*. Instead he mooted *\*badi(ya)kara- / bazi(ya)kara-*, on the basis of Elamite *bazikara*, understandably attracted by the *kurtaš bazikaraš* on PT 41 (466 BC) which would be a precise equivalent to *grd bdkr*. (Benveniste 1954, 297-310, at 308 had already noted this.). But (a) *bazikara-* (a well-attested word) is cognate with *baziš* (another well-attested word), meaning tax (so the *kurtaš bazikaraš* are putatively tax-handlers); and (b) Aramaic *bdykr*, with a “d” is not what one would expect from OP *\*bājikara-*. Muraoka & Porten 2003, 342 identify *bdykr* as *\*badikara-*, translating “artisan” (a term also used by Lindenberger). They cite Hinz 1975, 64 in justification, but that passage is actually about *\*bāryakara*, and *\*badikara-* seems to be a phantom. (Porten-Yardeni similarly print *bdykr*, while translating “artist”, albeit in capitals to indicate uncertainty.)

A quite different explanation (suggested by David Taylor) is that *bdykrn* = *b* + *dykrn*, the latter a possible alternative writing for *dkrn* = “memorandum”. The phrase (*bdkrn zyly*) would then mean “in or according to my memorandum” and the reference would be to some sort of document that establishes payment rates. There is perhaps no *precise* parallel to this postulated use of the word among its quite numerous (at least thirteen) appearances in Achaemenid era texts in the Bible and from Egypt, Idumaea, Persepolis and Bactria, and the spelling with *d* rather than *z* is much less usual.<sup>252</sup> But these are certainly not definitively cogent counter-arguments (and in particular “memorandum” is intrinsically a concept of potentially wide application).

At this point a grammatical issue needs discussion. Grammatically speaking *grd* is in the absolute or construct state, so if *bdykrn* is an Aramaic plural we have “a/the worker of {whatever}”. This seems rather odd, but *grd ’mnn* (6.10:2-3: “personnel of artisans”) would be a parallel.<sup>253</sup> Effectively *grd* + plural noun = “worker-{whatevers}”, and the pair of words virtually operates as a plural noun agreeing with the preceding word *’hrnn* (other). Lindenberger translates as “artisans on my staff”.

---

<sup>252</sup> Ezra 4.15 (“the books of memoranda of your fathers” show that Judah is a rebellious province), 6.2 (the decree of Cyrus for the restoration of the temple described as a memorandum), TADAE A4.9 (memorandum of the decision of Bagavahya and Delaiah about the Elephantine temple), C3.13 (eight memoranda about different things -- lists of cups; list of grain disbursements to women; bits of wood; jars etc. -- each one headed ZKRN), C3.8 IIIB.16 (memorandum about Bagaphernes), 28,34 (other ones without preserved context), D3.1,19,21 (in accounts fragments), ISAP 1653 + 1623 (Yardeni & Porten 2008: memorandum of the barley of Wahabi, followed by a list of things owed by various people), ISAP 1625 (mentioned *ibid.* 738), PFAE 2043:01: “memorandum” (*zkrn*), ADAB C4.52 (small list of commodities headed *ldkrn* = “as a memorandum”), a post-Achaemenid text from Sharjah text (Teixidor 1992; Puech 1998, 38-48: *dkrn* in reference to a tomb or the act of remembrance represented by a tomb). The word is only written with D, not Z, in D3.1 (early fifth century), ISAP 1653 + 1623, ISAP 1625 (late Achaemenid), and the post-Achaemenid Sharjah text.

<sup>253</sup> But see n. ad loc. for an alternative suggestion that *’mnn* is in apposition to *grd*.

If *bdykrn zyly* = “in a memorandum of mine”, we have “like the other [plural]” followed by absolute or construct singular *grd* followed by “in my memorandum”. Is that grammatically feasible?

Elsewhere *grd* appears with a final aleph (*grd'* = the *garda*) in A6.10:1-4,5,8, A6.15:8,9,10, and without one in A6.10:2,6 (in both cases with *'mnn*: see above). It never appears with a plural ending; but contextually a multiplicity of persons is surely what is normally intended, so the word is actually treated as a grammatically singular collective.

Collective nouns *are* referred to by plural pronominal morphemes (Muraoka & Porten 2003, 185), but the issue is the treatment of adjectives, for which see Muraoka & Porten 2003, 281. First, they cite C3.15:1 *hyl Yhwdy'*, but that may be affected by the fact that the whole phrase of which it is part is about the names (plural) of the Jewish troop. Then the footnote draws attention to the reference in A4.7:8 to *hyl' 'hrnn*. This is further discussed on p.284, where they argue that it does not just mean “the other troop(s)” (though that is how it is translated in Porten-Yardeni) or for that matter “d'autres militaires” (Grelot), but that *'hrnn* is an accusative of specification or in apposition.

But what *that* underlines is that back in A6.12 it is, after all, apposition that we are dealing with -- though an apposition the other way around. That is, if *'hrnn* was supposed to qualify *grd* it surely ought to follow it (despite Muraoka & Porten 2003, 238 on dialects where that might *not* happen with precisely this adjective). So what we are really (hypothetically) dealing with here is “like others, *viz.* *grd*, in my memorandum” (cf. Whitehead 1974, 88 for the apposition). That seems to me sufficiently feasible for the whole idea to be taken seriously.<sup>254</sup> If it is accepted, the passage would be referring to some separate document laying out ration-levels, and would be an exception to the general avoidance of specific reference to bureaucratic process (cf. A6.11:3 n.).

line 2 *ptkrn*, “statues”. Iranian *\*patikara-* “statue” (Tavernier 2007, 35, Porten-Yardeni) or “sculpture” (Tavernier 2007, 79, Driver, Grelot). The Aramaic word appears otherwise in KAI 258 (a text from Kesek Köyü in Cilicia, variously said to be fifth or fourth century, in which someone has erected a *ptkr* and anyone who damages it invites divine punishment<sup>255</sup>), CG 121bis (a shattered ostrakon, one side of which may in successive lines have “for the statue” and “for you 10 karsha”) and – as an element in a compound word – in ADAB C6:5, C7:4, where *ptkrw* (Iranian *\*patikaravant-*) describes a harness as “decorated by a picture”.<sup>256</sup> In none of these cases is there any obvious special reason why the writer resorted to a Persian loan-word.<sup>257</sup>

<sup>254</sup> Since the scribe made an error in line 2 in initially omitting the words “and the people of his household”, the possibility might be entertained that there is an error in the set of words we are concerned with here. But I do not think we could reasonably say that he ought to have written *grdn* or *grdy'*, there being no evidence he might ever have thought of doing so. And the difference between *grd'* (which he *might* have written) and *grd* is not substantive for the present purposes.

<sup>255</sup> Various restored and translated as: “Dieses Bildnis hat aufgerichtet NNST vor Adrason, weil er beschützt hat meine Seele, die ihm gehört. Wer aber Böses mit diesem Bildnis vornimmt: S(h)HR und Shamash mögen (es) von ihm fördern” (Donner-Röllig) or “Ce relief, Nanast (l)'a érigé devant/en faveur de 'D/RM/RSW/PN/R et la demeure funéraire qui est à lui. Et quiconque ferait du mal à ce relief, alors que le recherchent Sahar et Shamash” (<http://www.achemenet.com/pdf/arameens/cilicie05.pdf> [Lemaire]). Lipinski had Nanašta erecting figure in front of an oak.

<sup>256</sup> That is the translation in Naveh & Shaked 2012, 217,222-223. But is not the reference more likely to be to three-dimensional decorations on the harness-straps?

<sup>257</sup> Other Aramaic terms for statue or the like include: *šlmh* (Elnaf Stele) – Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995 s.v. indicate that this can be statue, relief, or even painting (at Hatra) -- and *sml'* (Sultaniye Köy text): statue or image (Hoftijzer & Jongeling, otherwise citing only Phoenician/Punic items). Coincidentally, an apparently purely Aramaic word *ptyk* perhaps meaning “adorned” appears Bowman 1970 nos. 9, 13, 14, 17 (cf. Naveh & Shaked 1971, 456).

The same word is represented by Elamite *battikarum* in the Behistun text (DB [Elamite] iii 85 = §§65-66), where it refers to stone reliefs,<sup>258</sup> and *battikuraš* in PTT 17 (wooden), 24 (stone and wood), 1957-1 (stone and wood), 1963-5 (wood), where Cameron renders it variously as sculptures (17) or reliefs (24, 1957-1, 1963-5). If it is true that *\*patikara-* literally means “reproduction” (so Grillot-Susini, Herrenschildt & Malbrat 1993, 58 n.160; cf. Grelot 1972, 318)<sup>259</sup> – and perhaps in any case – there is little chance that we can greatly limit the range of things Hinzani might have been making (or their scale) on purely linguistic grounds.<sup>260</sup>

lines 2-3 *prš...swsh 'm rkbh...wptkrn 'hrnn*, “horsemen (?)...horse with its rider...and other statues” What is Hinzani to produce? There are *prima facie* three elements: *prš*; *swsh 'm rkbh*; *ptkrn 'hrnn*. The last is oddly vague. (Were it not for the *vav* in front of *ptkrn* one might perhaps understand the “other statues” to be the things that Hinzani made previously.) The other two are *prima facie* “horseman” and “horse with its rider”. Grelot’s version of line 2 (below) and Whitehead’s treatment of *rkb* (below) are *inter alia* attempts to eliminate a perceived tautology. Another might be to distinguish between a man on horseback (*prš*) and a dismounted man next to a horse (*swsh 'm rkbh*). (Arshama’s own seal had an unmounted horse. Of course, it had already long existed when A6.12 was written, and the scene it shows is rather more complex than “horse-with-man”.) The question of what he is producing is not only one of subject matter but also scale. The idea that seal-stones are involved has been in the literature at least since John Boardman’s suggestion, reported by Michael Roaf (1980, 72, 74 n.3). For those who are sure Arshama is in Babylon or Susa at the time of writing this has obvious attractions. But we should perhaps keep an open mind about Arshama’s whereabouts (on this topic see Introduction pp.26-30), and there is nothing in the language of the actual letter that imposes any limit on the size of Hinzani’s products. The inclination to be surprised that the letter is not more specific should be tempered by the recollection that its primary purpose is to issue orders about rations and that both Arshama and Hinzani knew what was on order. What is said defines what is involved quite adequately (perhaps more than adequately) for managers and accountants.

line 2 *prš*, “horsemen (?)”. *Prš* only occurs here in Egyptian or Biblical Aramaic, but is also encountered in the Achaemenid era in some Arad ostraca (7,8,11) and PFAT 196, where it means “horseman” or (in the plural form) “horsemen”, and in various earlier or later texts. In the Bible the Hebrew word occurs in the singular in Nahum 3.3, but is normally plural and means “horsemen”. (It often appears alongside *rekeb*, a grammatically singular collective term for “chariotry”. Some think that in some case *pršym* refers to chariot-crews.) In allied languages we also have *prš* = horseman (with the plural form regularly attested) in Targum Aramaic (Jastrow, Sokoloff), Nabataean (Starcky 1971, 151: *rb pršy'*, “captain of horsemen”; J 227: *'šm prš'*, “Ašem the horseman”; J 246: *pršy' nšryn*, guard-horsemen) and Palmyrene (SBS 51.3f: *prsy' b'br dy* PN = “horsemen of the wing of PN”). The only sign that *prš* might be a singular collective for “cavalry” is the seventh c. Afis Stele (KAI 202B = Gibson 1975 no.5), where the words *lrkb wlpřš* are variously understood as “for rider and horse” (Gibson) or “for chariots and cavalry” (KAI). (The inscription is damaged hereabouts, and the words are isolated; so immediate context is not available to cast light on the proper translation.)

<sup>258</sup> DB §§65-66 is where Darius tells the viewer not to destroy “these inscriptions and these reliefs”. The Elamite text uses the word *innakqanuma* (“Wirklichkeitsdarstellung”: Hinz-Koch 1987 s.v.) but in §65 it glosses this with *battikarum*. The Babylonian text uses the word *šalmu*.

<sup>259</sup> The MP and Parthian versions of *\*patikara-* are used of royal relief-busts in Sasanian inscriptions. In modern Persian the word is variously said to mean “figure, model portrait, effigy”. The fundamental etymological connotation of the word at any date is counterfeit or reproduction.

<sup>260</sup> Sokoloff 2002, 948 glosses *ptkr* as “image, idol spirit” (cf. Jastrow: *p<sup>e</sup>takra* = idol, painted thing).

line 2 *ptkrn zy prš [...] yhwwn*, “statues [on] which there shall be horsemen (?)”. There is room for at most three letters in the lacuna. Driver (rightly rejecting impossible suggestions from Mittwoch and Henning) translated “sculptures of a horseman, (which) shall be ....”. Lindenberger’s “statues of a horseman [...]. They should be [...].” is effectively similar. Porten-Yardeni (“statues of a horseman ... will be”) left the gap unfilled. Grelot sought to fill it by reading *ptkrn prš <bh> yhwwn* = “sculptures sur lesquelles il y aura de la cavalerie”, where *prš* is taken as a collective (as perhaps, but not necessarily, in KAI 202B: see above, previous note), and therefore given a plural verb. (For some this translation may evoke a mental image of the groups of horsemen on the Limyra heroon reliefs,<sup>261</sup> but there is no guarantee that we should be thinking of a product on that scale. Seal-stones could be cut to show more than one horse, so the proper translation cannot perhaps be limited by purely material considerations.) Whitehead 1974, 88 doubted the reading *yhwwn* (retained in Porten-Yardeni, albeit with dots), suggesting *yhwnt* and wondered if it was a PN, giving the translation “reliefs of a mounted soldier of PN”. But he did not fill the lacuna.

line 2 *rkbh*, “its rider”. Whitehead suggested that, if *swsh* = horse (as it must: this at least seems to be nearly a fixed point in debates about the current passage<sup>262</sup>), *prš* must mean something else (so horseman – which would be the natural assumption: see above) and therefore *rkbh* must mean something else again, e.g. chariot.

In Egyptian Aramaic *rkb* is attested (i) as a verb meaning either to ride - on a horse (*swsh hd*: C1.1:38) or horses (*swsyn*: C2.1:7.44 = 8.59) or an ass (C1.1:203) – or to shoot an arrow (C1.1:126,128,190: because one “mounts” the arrow on the bow) and (ii) a noun meaning “the act of riding” (C1.1:204). More problematic is the phrase *rkbyn swsyn* in Saqqara 62. Segal suggested “charioteers, horsemen”, whereas Hoftijzer & Jongeling seem happy to take it to designate “horses for riding” (treating *rkb* as a verbal adjective?). Alternatively both A6.12:2 and Saqqara 62:2 may be evidence for the noun “rider” (giving for Saqqara 62, “riders, horses”). In any case, to retreat from *swsh* = “horse” without seriously cogent evidence seems an unattractive option, and Saqqara 62 (like most of the Saqqara texts) is unfortunately too fragmentary to be cogent evidence for much.

In Biblical Hebrew *rakab* = mount/ride, but *rekeb* is regularly a collective noun meaning “chariotry” and occasionally either a singular noun meaning “chariot” (1 Kings 22.35,38, 2 Kings 9.21,24, 2 Chron.35.24; and perhaps Ex.14.6) or a plural one meaning “chariots” (Ct.1.9). A Sendjirli text (KAI 215:10 = Gibson 1975 no.14) has *b’ly rkb* which has been rather variously interpreted, with *rkb* taken both collectively and as meaning “a chariot”: it is certainly hard to see that it can mean “rider”. By contrast, and tantalizing for the reader of A6.12, we have the Palmyrene text SBS 48:6, where we meet *šlm mrkb swsy* and its Greek equivalent *ephippon an[dria]nta*.

The upshot is that *rkb* = “rider” is only rather elusively attested;<sup>263</sup> but A6.12 and Saqqara 62 *might* support one another, and the Palmyrene text is highly pertinent. There is also the separate question of whether “a horse and its chariot” – especially if this really means one without driver or other occupant -- seems a likely subject for Ḥinzani’s skills. We might think, but without much conviction, of the empty chariot of Zeus in Hdt.7.40: its *eight* white horses would be a lot to fit on a seal-stone at any rate (see above, note on lines 2-3).

<sup>261</sup> Borchhardt 1976, 49-80, figs.12-15, pl.20-26.

<sup>262</sup> Only nearly: Segal wanted *rkbyn swsyn* in Saqqara 62.2 to mean “charioteers, horsemen” (see below).

<sup>263</sup> Sokoloff 2002, 1083 registers only verbal uses of *rkb*. Jastrow 1479 finds one example of the noun.

line 2 *lqbl zy qdmn 'bd qdm'*, “just as previously he made before me”. Whitehead notes this as one example of word-play in the letters, comparing A6.7:8-9 (*'yš* and *b'yš*), A6.11:2 (*wbgh...bgw*), A6.14:2 (*mndt' mnd'm*).<sup>264</sup> The phenomenon is not confined to Arshama: cf. A4.7:16 (*klby'* and *kbl'*). Nor should one forget the alliterations of *šlm* and *šrrt* in greeting formulae in Arshama’s letters and elsewhere (A6.3:1 n.).

line 2 *qdmn 'bd*, “previously he made”. Fleischer 1983 observed Hinzani was being asked to make more of something he had already made before, found an analogy for the situation in the Mourning Penelope statue from Persepolis (conceived as a repetition [*Wiederholung*] of an existing statue<sup>265</sup>) and speculated about how the new Hinzani piece(s) might have differed from the existing one(s), especially if he was doing them from memory (i.e. if the existing one[s] were in Susa/Babylon): a situation of “freie, nicht massgleiche Wiederholung”, albeit somewhat constrained by the strict “Typenbindung” of Achaemenid art. This is a rather overheated reaction to the master-patron-employer’s simple demand for “more of the same”. Arshama’s instruction to Hinzani is no more about the fundamental nature of Achaemenid art than is the Jews’ wish for Elephantine temple to be built as it was before (A4.7:25//A4.8:24)

line 3 *whwšry yhytw 'ly*, “and send (them and) let them bring (them) to me”. Arshama is remote from the whereabouts of Hinzani and Nakhthor. We might infer from the reference to Susa in line 1 that he is actually in Susa, that being the explanation of the otherwise (indeed perhaps still) rather inconsequential piece of information about Hinzani’s trip there. But this is not absolutely certain: cf. line 1 n.

line 3 *l'bq wl'bq*, “with haste and haste”. Compare A3.8:13 – unless in that case, with Whitehead (*contra* Driver 1965, 74), one takes one *l'bq* with the preceding imperative and one with the following one. (For a different repetition-trope cf. *zn zn* = “of each kind” in A6.1.)

line 3 *'Rtwhy...spr'*, “Artavahya...scribe”. cf. A6.10:10 n. and Appendix 1.

line 4 *hmrkry'*, “accountants”. See 6.11:7 n.

---

<sup>264</sup> He actually cites all of A6.13:1-2,3,4-5 and A6.14:2,3,5, but this overstates the case.

<sup>265</sup> Not necessarily entirely correctly. Palagia 2008 takes the view that the two versions could be contemporary; the idea that the Persepolis one is later derives from a judgment that the Roman copies presuppose a more archaic style – a judgement Palagia questions, because one cannot assume that Roman copyists were so historically picky.

## A6.13 = Driver 10 = Grelot 71 = Lindenberger 44

### Securing domain-income (1)

#### Summary

Arshama tells his *pqyd* Nakhtor and other officials to ensure that Varuvahya's *pqyd* sends rent-income to Babylon.

#### Date

None given.

#### Text

The text is well preserved. Even Lindenberger finds little occasion to identify more uncertainty than Porten-Yardeni.

#### Place of letter in the set

This letter from Arshama is a pair with A6.14, written by Varuvahya to Nakhtor on the same subject. Compare the relationship between A6.15 (Virafsha to Nakhtor) and the fragmentary D6.7 (Arshama to Nakhtor).

line 1 *br byt'*, "prince". See Introduction pp.21-25.

line 1 *bznh*, "in this (place)". That is in Babylon (line 5; and A6.14:5). Arshama is also definitely not in Egypt at the time, but in Babylon. In a similar situation in D6.7 fr.c:1 (as restored), Arshama seems to have reported Virafsha's complaint to him about Nakhtor as occurring specifically "here at my Gate" (*tnh bt'r' zyly*).

line 1 *bg'*, "domain". See 6.4:2 n. Varuvahya speaks of Arshama having given him a domain (*bg'*) in the singular, but when asking for his *mndt* in line 3 he switches to the plural (*bgy'*), and Arshama repeats the plural in his reply (line 4). In A6.14:4 it becomes singular again (when the *mndt*-demand is not, apparently, under discussion). Arshama's domains always appear in the plural (albeit in a formulaic phrase), while Peṭosiri always (modestly?) speaks of his father's domain in the singular (A6.11).

line 1 *mn mr'y*, "by my lord". It is notable that, whereas in A6.4:1 Ankhohapi's *dšn* is given by the king and Arshama, the higher status Varuvahya apparently gets his domain from just Arshama. Perhaps the rhetoric of the situation leads Varuvahya to highlight the link with Arshama, since it is Arshama whom he is asking to intervene on his behalf.

line 2 *hn 'l mr'y lm kwt tb*, "if it (seems) like a good thing to my lord": cf. A6.7:8 n. It is notable that here and in the previous line one "son of the house" refers to and addresses another as "my lord".

line 3,4 *hndrz*, "order": see A6.10:12 n. Presumably the assumption is that Nakhtor, as agent not just of any royal prince but of the one who is satrap of Egypt, will have special authority. (In what way the accountants add to that authority, except by force of numbers, is not clear.) Nakhtor (and the accountants) also have the advantage of being, unlike Varuvahya, on the spot - or at least somewhere in Egypt. Varuvahya, by contrast, is (cf. A6.14:2,5) in Babylon. The

assumption is also that Arshama is not on the spot. (See Introduction pp.26-30.) For the putatively Persianizing phrase *hndrz* ‘*bdw* cf. A6.3:6 n.

line 3 *Htwbsty*, “Aḥatubaste”. For Porten & Lund 2003, 322 (after Muchiki 1999, 65) the name combines Aramaic *’hh / ’htw* with the Egyptian god-name Bastet, giving the meaning “sister of Bastet”. (It does not seem to figure anywhere in Porten 2002, presumably because deemed to be a hybrid.) Others have postulated an Akkadian name \*Ḥatu-bāšī or \*Aḥatu-bāšī, appealing to the analogy of Ḥā-bāšī / Ḥā-bāstī / Aḥi-basti / Ḥā-bāssī (PNAE 2.1, 435-436) and more generally to the existence of other names containing one of the other component.<sup>266</sup> The authors of the PNAE entry take this to mean “the brother is my pride” (so \*Ḥatu-bāšī / \*Aḥatu-bāšī would be “the sister is my pride”<sup>267</sup>), but other interpretations are cited, linking it variously with Aramaic *hbš* = “to bind” (Zadok) or – once again -- Egyptian Bastet (Lipinski). On the Porten & Lund view we are perhaps dealing with a native Egyptian of mixed background, whereas the other view might point at an outsider (Virafsha’s Miçapata in A6.15).<sup>268</sup>

line 3 *mndt*, “revenue”. Also variously translated as “rent” (Driver, Porten-Yardeni, Lindenberger) or “taxe” (Grelot). Briant 2006, 351 describes it as “le résultat foncier propre de la mise en valeur des terres (dans le cadre d’une saine gestion de sa Maison: *ta idia*), déduction faite des impôts et taxes qu’il doit en tout état de cause verser au trésor royale” – which sides with the former interpretation, while acknowledging that tax might be due. (Herodotus’ notion that the uniquely valued Zopyrus was given Babylon *atelea nemesthai* [3.160] rather assumes that tax would be owed by less exceptionally honoured beneficiaries.) Our “revenue” seeks to be as non-committal as (perhaps) *mndt* was.

The word (probably derived from Akkadian *maddattu*<sup>269</sup>) is known in various other Achaemenid contexts.

- DB (Akkadian) where it designates royal tribute.
- Ezra, where is it one of the three taxes of Transeuphratene along with *belo* and *halak* (4.13, 20, 6.8, 7.24), but is also used by itself in reference to the tax of that region or the King’s tax owed by Jews (6.8).
- The Egyptian Customs Document (C3.7), where it is collected from ships and goes to the King’s House.
- ADAB A8:2, which refers to royal *mndh*, as something to be brought to the letter-writer (? Akhvamazda) at the fortress Zarimpi – i.e. (if *Zrympy* were an error for *Zryspy*) Zariaspa, the fortress at Bactra. Naveh & Shaked 2012, 30 suggest that *mlk*’ sometimes actually denotes the satrap (adducing the “camels of the king” in A1:3) but do not comment on the implications of this view for the character of the *mndh*. But their adoption of the translation “rent” (2012, 120) may suggest that they are thinking

---

<sup>266</sup> Driver 1965, 76,79, Grelot (1974, 460, 474), specifically citing Tallqvist 1914, 15 (for Ḥā-bāšī etc.), and Stamm 1939, 126 and AHw 112b (for other *-bašī* formations). How cogent the analogies are for later 5<sup>th</sup> c. onomastics is perhaps debatable.

<sup>267</sup> Driver and Grelot adopted a different meaning for the second element (the same word, *baštu*, is in question), giving “the (divine) sister is my guardian angel”, “La Soeur est mon Esprit protecteur”.

<sup>268</sup> I am grateful to Heather Baker and Stephanie Dalley for help with this item.

<sup>269</sup> Kaufman 1974, 67. For the meaning of the word CAD s.v. *maddattu* gives: 1. tribute (MA, NA, Ach.), 2. work assignment (MB), 3. endowment capital (Ugarit), 4. compensation for slaves (also temple oblates) paid by the slaves or their employers to their owners (NB), 5. rent (for fields etc.), additional fee [a usage peculiar to Murašu texts: cf. Stolper 1985, 140] (LB).

of income from Akhvamazda's estates. One might well regard all of this as over-influenced by assumptions derived from the prevalent reading of A6.13.

- An Elephantine document where it may be the income that could be had from leasing out a slave (B3.6) – though the text is not easy,<sup>270</sup> and the possibility of a parallel in B8.11 should not be relied upon.<sup>271</sup> This slave-related use of *mndt* would, of course, broadly correspond to use of Akkadian *mandattu* to designate a payment to the owner of a slave made by the slave himself or someone employing him in compensation for the fact that the slave is currently working for someone other than his proper owner.<sup>272</sup>
- A number of other fragments from the Bodleian archive, Elephantine and Saqqara. *Mndh* is an isolated word in the Bodleian fragment D6.13[d], from a supposed private letter. CG 164, 168 and 273 are also quite unhelpful (even if the presence of *mndh* is rightly recognized in the first place). C3.5:7 and Saqqara 24:11 both refer to *mndt hyl'*. The rest of the remnants of these two documents offer no clear hint about what this might mean (Saqqara 24 also mentions a group of 200 men, alabaster, natron, and some other commodity [all in huge amounts] and a quantity of silver, while C3.5 is a list of quantities of silver, perhaps from a variety of sources: “priests in the houses of god” are mentioned in line 11) but, since *hyl* and *degelin* can be linked with land-holding,<sup>273</sup> *mndt* no doubt *could* denote land-related payments – perhaps marginally more likely to be tax owed by the *hyl* than rent owed to it?<sup>274</sup> In B8.5:2 *mndh* is one of two non-contiguous surviving words in a line. The other word is *gnz'* (treasure/treasury), which also appears in the previous line. The near-contiguity of these two words recalls the present text, in which the *mndt* is going to be brought to Babylon at the same time as *gnz'*, but the coincidence offers no clear help in understanding B8.5, not least because the reference of *gnz'* in A6.13 is debatable. The document (which Porten-Yardeni label as a “Court Record re Rent, Imprisonment, Payment”) also mentions a *rb dgl*, a man with an Iranian name (Tiripata) and someone making a payment, but it is possible that they are part of a distinct section within the record and have nothing to do with *mndt'* and *gnz'*.<sup>275</sup>

---

<sup>270</sup> After Tapamet and Jehoishma are manumitted nobody is entitled “to or traffic with you (for) payment of silver (*lmzlkyl mndt ksp*)” (Porten-Yardeni) or “t'évaluer contre paiement d'argent” (Grelot 1972, 226) or “sell thee for payment of silver” (Kraeling 1953, 181, 184). The verb is identified by Kraeling and Grelot as *zll* or *zwl*. It recurs in A4.3:5 (where Porten-Yardeni render “lavish” [i.e. spend generously], Grelot “évaluez des biens”). In JBA *zll* = “to debase, disgrace, become cheap; treat with disrespect; establish a low price etc.” and *zwl* = “low price” (Sokoloff), and Grelot considers these overtones to be present in B3.6 as well, whereas (judging by their rendering of A4.3:5) Porten-Yardeni do not. (Kraeling notes them, but does not incorporate them in his formal translation.) Lund & Porten 2002 do not appear to list the verb; and Porten 2011, 222 n.14 concedes that *lmzlkyl mndt* is “difficult to translate precisely”.

<sup>271</sup> Segal's version of this document (Saqqara 21) mentioned slaves and *mndt*. But the reading in B8.11 has removed any reference to slaves, and *mndh* is translated non-committally “rent”.

<sup>272</sup> Dandamaev 1985, 113-114, 379-383, 531-532; Jursa 2010, 230, 234, 236-237, 279, 683, 779.

<sup>273</sup> A5.2, A5.5. B8.10, Saqqara 31:1, Saqqara 46:2.

<sup>274</sup> In Saqqara 31:1 could be read as indicating that something goes from the *hyl* to the royal treasury (*byt mlk*).

<sup>275</sup> The word for payment is *'gr*, also found in A3.10 (“rent” of a boat), B1.1:14 (apparently “hire”, as opposed to using one's own), C1.1:100 (*b'l 'gr*, “master of wages” [Porten-Yardeni] – i.e. employer?), and Saqqara 10 (translated “hire”, but a note suggests “rent” or “lease” as alternatives: the context is opaque). One sees why the general environment would incline Porten-Yardeni (mindful also, doubtless, of B3.6) to take *mndh* as rent rather than tax. (*'gr* is cognate with Akkadian *agāru* “to hire” and *igru* “hire, rent wages”: cf. Kaufman 1974, 33. I thank Stephanie Dalley for drawing this to my attention.)

It does have to be said that the evidence in this material for *mndh* being tribute or taxation is more unequivocal than that for it being rent. But the eagerness of Varuvahya to receive the *mndt* of his domains does seem more natural if it is income for his benefit rather than tax for the royal treasury.

There is a temptation to suppose that the *mndt* paid by domains to their high-level Iranian owners interlocks with the *hlk* paid to those owners' estate by people like Peṭosiri (A6.11:5 n.); the terms are kept distinct in Ezra, but that is all right, because they relate to different parts of the process of enriching Arshama and his like. Terminologically speaking one might even say *mndt* going to "sons of the house" matches *mndt* going to the King, and perhaps whether we choose to call it "tax" or "rent" is from one point of view a matter of somewhat anachronistic choice. (But I am inclined to assume that the obligation on Ḥatubasti and Nakhtḥor to "disburse" [*hnpq*] the *mndh* is an obligation that lies upon them *qua* administrators, not *qua* individual leaseholders, *pace* Szubin & Porten 1987, 46 and Thoneman 2009.)

line 3 *yhnpq wyhyth*, "disburse...and bring". More literally, "make it go out and make it come". Whitehead saw this as hendiadys, the only difference being the point of reference (source or destination). Perhaps that over-states the case, the difference being significant: our translation (like Porten-Yardeni's "release .... bring...") makes a decent substantive distinction, as (in a different way) does Driver's observation that "the first verb refers to the exaction or collection of the rents in Egypt while the second refers to their delivery in Babylon". In line 5 the pair of instructions is extended to include the order to Ḥatubasti to come (to Babylon), and – since *wyhyth* does not necessarily have the overtones of "bring" -- that is a genuine further requirement (see n. ad loc.).

line 4 *'sprn*, "in full". Iranian *\*usprna-* (Tavernier 2007, 406-7, reporting on a debate as to whether the proper form is that or *\*asprna*), "in full, entire". It is also attested in KAI 263 (the Abydos weight which is "completely according to the silver stater") and (as *'šprn*') on a damaged weight in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Ledrain 1886). The *ušbarnašbe* in PT 12,13,15,18 and 1957-1 were originally understood as labourers who were "up-carriers", but then as labourers "die vollständig [zu Lasten der Krone verpflegt werden]" (Hinz-Koch, after Cameron 1958).

line 5 *hd'bgw*, "(accrued) interest". Iranian *\*hadābigāva-*, "interest included, with interest, accrued increment" (Tavernier 2007, 443). "Interest" (also in Driver, Grelot, Lindenberger) rather implies that the *pqyd* is actually bound by a contract complete with penalty clauses. "Increment" (Porten-Yardeni) might be something that would be owed in any event (as presumably payment "in full" is owed in any event) – in effect an obligation upon whoever the direct sources of *mndt* actually are.

line 5 *wy'th*, "and...come". Ḥatubasti does not merely have to hand the *mndt* over for someone else to transport. But this is not quite true, since (A6.14:4-5) Varuvahya was actually prepared to allow Ḥatubasti to be substituted by his brother or son. Is this an actual change of mind between the writing of two letters which it is natural to assume were composed at almost exactly the same time? Is Varuvahya offering a concession (softening a demand that Arshama had made which exceeded Varuvahya's original request: cf. above, note on line 3)? Or is the suggestion that, having offended his master, Ḥatubasti might send his brother or son actually a form of blackmail trading on Ḥatubasti's unwillingness to expose others of his family to danger?

line 5 *gnz'*, “treasure”. Iranian \**ganza-*, “treasure” (Tavernier 2007, 443) recurs in Egyptian Aramaic texts (in A6.2:4,13, B8.5:3), as well as in Elamite and Greek. \**Ganzabara-* / \**gandabara-* are also found in Aramaic, Akkadian and Elamite form: see Tavernier 2007, 422, and add e.g. Tel 'Ira no.8 (Naveh 1999, 412-413, with Lemaire 2002a, 227 or 2002b, 140) Naveh 1981, 166 (no.37), ADAB B10, PFAT 64, 234(?).<sup>276</sup> Expressing the idea of transporting profits in terms of “treasure” recalls PF 1357 where Babylonian treasure (Elamite *kapnuški*) is being taken from Susa to Persepolis in 499 BC. (The context is perhaps (royal] tax: cf. Tuplin 2007, 329 for this and other relevant texts.) It is perfectly possible, but not demonstrable, that the convoy of “treasure” which Arshama has ordered brought to Babylon includes more than just the *mndt* of his own and other royal princes' domains: the question is whether *gnz'* in Arshama's order refers to something substantively different from (additional to) the transport of Arshama's *mndt* alluded to by Varuvahya. Was Arshama's “private” *mdnt* carried along with other (state) income from the satrapy?<sup>277</sup> It is a natural assumption, since the world of “treasure”, “treasuries” and “treasurers” is so often an official one, but perhaps insecure.

line 5 *šym*, “was issued”. An abbreviation for *šym t'm*; cf. 6.3:6 n. -- Note that Arshama does not threaten interrogation or a *gst ptgm* in this letter where he is only acting on the complaints of someone else outside his estate (albeit another Persian estate-owner).

line 5 *Bbl*, “Babylon”. cf. A6.12:1 n.

line 5 *'Rtwhy...spr'*, “Artavahya...scribe”: cf. A6.10:10 n., and Appendix 1.

line 6 *hmrkry'*, “accountants”. cf. A6.11:7 n.

line 11 *Ḫotepḫep*: See 6.11:8 n. and Appendix 1.

---

<sup>276</sup> See Stolper <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/ganzabara->

<sup>277</sup> An argument against this would be that Varuvahya's request was for his *pqyd* to be told to disburse the rent and bring it along with the rent that Nakhthor is bringing and that Arshama's response, that Nakhthor should tell Varuvahya's *pqyd* to disburse the rent and bring it and come with the “treasure” which Arshama has ordered brought to Babylon, should correspond one-to-one with that request – in which case the “treasure” is another way of describing Arshama's own rent. The counter-argument to this would be that Arshama is not replying directly to Varuvahya, so that the principle of epistolary symmetry need not apply exactly. Arshama alludes to a separate order already issued about transfer of “treasure” and this could have referred to something different from (or bigger than) the mere transfer of “rent”. Varuvahya assumed in his request the obvious thing was to marry his rent-transfer to Arshama's; Arshama may have known different.

## A6.14 = Driver 11 = Grelot 72 = Lindenberger 45

### Securing domain-income (2)

#### Summary

Varuvahya writes to Nakhtor and other officials on the issue also dealt with in A6.13

#### Date

None given.

#### Text

Lindenberger's text displays the usual sort of variations from Porten-Yardeni's. There are no substantive implications.

line 1 *'Htwbsty*, "Aḥatubaste". See A6.13:3 n.

line 2 *mndt' mnd'm*, "any re[ven]u[e]": see A6.12:2 n.

line 2 *m[nd]t[']... 'h[r.....].t mhytyn bb'l*, "re[ven]u[e]. Oth[er officials (??)] are bringing [revenue (?)] to Babylon". Whitehead queries restorations (like that in Porten-Yardeni, followed here) which put *mndt'* in the gap towards start of line – slightly oddly, since he is separately struck by word-play in these letters, of which the best example would be this phrase with *mndt'* restored (A6.12:2 n.). He also has a suggestion for the second part of the line, where Driver introduced a reference to a letter and Porten-Yardeni forbore to insert anything. Whitehead suggests: "and the tax which you have despatched, they are bringing to Babylon" – which does not at first sight make much sense in the context. We might suppose that some time has passed since A6.13, and that the second half of line 2 indicates that a convoy despatched by Nakhtor bringing *mndt* from Arshama's estate (but, despite A6.13, not *mndt* from Varuvahya's estate) has reached Babylon. But, if so, the plan in A6.13 that Nakhtor should travel with the convoy would have to be supposed to have been abandoned. And I wonder whether the tone of A6.14 would not be less placid – for on this scenario Nakhtor has already failed once to exert effective pressure on Ḥatubasti. More suitable to the situation is the suggestion incorporated in our translation (Varuvahya would then be drawing the sort of contrast that Arshama draws in A6.10). Whether it matches the space and the letter-traces after the lacuna is debatable.

line 2 *Bbl'*, "Babylon": cf A6.12:1 n.

line 3 *hndrz*, "instruction": see A6.13:3,4 n.

line 4 *thdwn*, "please". Driver had *thdwn*, Whitehead *t{h}hdwn*. For the verb cf. A3.5:2, A6.16:2-4, C1.1:90. Is the invitation to do something in order to please Varuvahya to be interpreted as a friendly request? Or is there a veiled threat in the event of Nakhtor's failure? How polite is Varuvahya *really* being under a veneer of good manners?

line 4 *'p...l' kšr*, "also...was not suitable". In the rest of this line Porten-Yardeni make out more text than Driver, but not sufficient to produce a clear picture. *kšr* = "(be) suitable" recurs in C3.22, which seems to be about land being suitable for some purpose. (The purpose is described as *'šk*, which Segal thought might mean "estate" or "allotment", citing Akkadian

*isqu*. Porten-Yardeni leave the word untranslated.) Is Varuvahya noting that he is particularly desirous of getting his *mndt* because the domain has not been functioning properly for some time? Lindenberger spells out such an idea by translating “As you know [the finances of] that estate have not been in order for many years” – or (an alternative on p.105) “that estate has not produced its proper [rent] for many years”. (No new Aramaic text is proposed to match these.)

line 5 *'hwhy 'r brh*, “his brother or his son”: cf. A6.13:5 n. and A6.3:1 n.

line 6 *Nhthwr wHndsyrm*, “Nakht̄or and H̄endasirma”. This time even the external address does not reveal the involvement of accountants – or indeed (contrast line 1) the presence of anyone except Nakht̄or and H̄endasirma. (This text establishes that Kenzasirma/H̄endasirma is not a title of Nakht̄or.) Perhaps the bureaucratic nicety of labelling Kenzasirma and his colleagues matters less to Varuvahya, who is writing a personal message to back-up the more formal instruction from Arshama.

## A6.15 = Driver 12 = Grelot 73 = Lindenberger 47

### Nakht̥or's misdeeds

#### Summary

Virafsha tells Nakht̥or to produce five Cilicians (in line with Arshama's instructions) and to return misappropriated goods

#### Date

None given.

#### Text

As usual Lindenberger is more conservative in the placing of square brackets and the marking of letters as damaged though reasonably certain.

#### The letter as object

The letter is written on a (rather neatly) mended piece of parchment, and the final two full lines and a word are written perpendicular to the rest of the text in the right margin: in other words the piece of parchment selected for the letter was not only damaged but also not quite large enough for the letter -- which is the second longest of the Bodleian collection (A6.10 is slightly longer). Might one legitimately feel that this is of a piece with some signs of carelessness in the formulation of the text of the letter?

#### Position of letter within the set

D6.7 dealt with the same subject matter as this letter. Virafsha, Miçapāta, Cilicians, Babylon, wine and the prospect of someone being called to account all figure in the remnants of what Porten-Yardeni restore as a letter from Arshama to Nakht̥or – so that A6.15 and D6.7 have the same sort of relation as A6.13 and A6.14.<sup>278</sup> Unfortunately what remains is too exiguous to cast substantive light on the episodes rehearsed by Virafsha in A6.15. The only hint of extra information is an allusion to 2 or more *karsh* of silver (D6.7 fr.[d]), but there is no way of knowing where this might have belonged in the record of Nakht̥or's misdeeds.

line 1 *Wrps̥*, “Virafša”. Iranian \*Virafša- (Tavernier 2007, 349: the name means “abundance”). The letter introduces us to a third Persian with an estate in Egypt. D6.7 fr.c:1 is restored to make him a *bar bayta*, like Arshama and Varuvahya, which seems a reasonable guess. Note that Varuvahya does not use the title when writing to Nakht̥or (A6.14), so its absence in the present letter is probably not a counter-indication. (It is true that the tone of the two letters is different: Varuvahya is asking for help with a problem not of Nakht̥or's making, whereas Virafsha is issuing demands and open threats. But I am not sure that this make much difference. It is begging the question to assume that Virafsha should have waved his royal status around because he was angry.) There is a conceivable reference to a “servant of Virafsha” in B8.6, a document from Saqqara understood by Porten-Yardeni as containing a list of court-decisions. Whether the probability that the relevant traces in B8.6:4 should be read “Virafsha” (Porten-Yardeni acknowledge *Wr.by* as a possible alternative) is enhanced by the fact that someone bearing his *pyd*'s name is also encountered at Saqqara (see next n.) is debatable.

---

<sup>278</sup> The fact that “wine” appears in fr.(d):2 and (e):3 is important because it links D6.7 to more than just the Cilician issue. That precludes what would anyway be a rash, if exciting, speculation that it is a copy of the letter to Psamshek mentioned in A6.15:1.

line 1 *Mspt*, “Misapata”. Unlike Arshama and Varuvahya, Virafsha has a *pqyd* with an Iranian name, though there has been disagreement about what the name is. Grelot (1972, 478) and Hinz (1975, 161,165) went for \*Masapāta- (“protected by the great ones”),<sup>279</sup> whereas Tavernier 2007, 246-7 favours \*Miçapāta- (“protected by Mithra”: equivalent to Mithrapates), a name found at Persepolis as Miššabadda (often) and Mšbd (Aramaic annotation on PF 1791<sup>280</sup>) and (more immediately interestingly) at Saqqara as *Mspṯ* (Demotic: SH5-434 rev. ii 7,11 [Smith & Martin 2010, no.4]) and *Msšṯpt* (Aramaic: Saqqara 13:2).

Both Saqqara documents are fragmentary. In the first \*Miçapata- has colleagues, is mentioned next to “Harmeten and his colleagues” and to the scribes of the nome, and (in a separate passage) next to some judges. In the other *Mššpt* is not far from a reference to chiefs of the *datbara* (law-officers of some sort). It is plainly tempting to identify these two individuals. Smith & Martin go further and identify him also with Virafsha’s \*Miçapata-, on the grounds that he too is a Persian high official and one associated with Arshama (like the man in SH5-434, a document involving Arshama).

But is an estate-*pqyd* a “Persian high official”? Or, to put the matter less loadedly, is the \*Miçapata- operating (with colleagues) in some sort of official context in 435 likely to turn up as an estate-*pqyd* a quarter-century or more later (on a conventional view of the Bodleian letters’ date) -- or indeed at any date? One’s instinctive reaction is that this would be a confusion of categories; but the fact that we are in any case dealing with an Iranian *pqyd*, not an Egyptian one, and that we cannot actually be entirely sure of the status of the \*Miçapata- of the Saqqara documents should perhaps give one pause. We do not know how being a prince’s estate manager might fit into the *cursus honorum* of middle-rank Persians – though we recall that Nakhthor gets pretty good rations when travelling to Egypt (A6.9).

A further complication is the debate that surrounds the status of the (mostly Iranian-named) *pqydyn* in A6.9, but since there is no evidence for \*Miçapata- being anything but an estate-*pqyd*, that debate is only really relevant for its effect on the number of analogies for Iranian-named estate-*pqydyn*. If we decide that the *pqydyn* of A6.9 are (state) provincial officials, not Arshama’s estate-agents, then \*Miçapata- can be viewed as a unique case *qua* estate-*pqyd* and it becomes easier to believe in his identity with the Saqqara man (on the principle that once you have one oddity you might as well have several). But if we do not decide things that way, and therefore allow that many estate-*pqydyn* were Iranian, we might then ask ourselves where men like Arshama recruit *pqydyn* of any sort except from the pool of potentially competent individuals who serviced the administrative needs of the imperial system and its component areas.<sup>281</sup> Expertise was surely necessary. It was that fact that made it perhaps advantageous in institutionally complex regions such as Babylonia or Egypt to have *pqydyn* of local origin: but the likes of Psamshek and Nakhthor did not enter the role without specific prior experience as well. In the case of Psamshek we can suspect that the prior experience included training by his father and predecessor,<sup>282</sup> but that need not have been the sum-total of his

<sup>279</sup> Partly on the basis of Greek Μασαβάτης (Plut.*Artox.*17), a name whose status as purely Iranian has, however, been questioned (Werba 1982, 266, Schmitt 2006, 163-166): the suggestion is that it is an Anatolian-Iranian hybrid corresponding to Bagapates (\*Bagapāta-) in Ctes.688 F16(66). See also Binder 2008, 253-255, for whom “Masabates” perhaps reached Plutarch from Dinon.

<sup>280</sup> A writing that *prima facie* yields \*Miçabāda- but is better seen as a version of *Mšṯpt* influenced by Elamite *Miššbad(d)a* (Tavernier).

<sup>281</sup> For an Iranian *paqdu* in Babylonia cf. Mitradata in TuM 2/3 147.

<sup>282</sup> In Babylonia Stolper 1985, 94 n.97 notes that Labaši, *paqdu* of Crown Prince’s Estate, might be the son of Nabu-mit-uballit, *šaknu* of the *ḫaṭru* of army-scribes – representing, perhaps, an improvement in status between the generations (cf. Stolper 1985, 54,60-61), if only because of the presumably greater prestige of the Crown Prince’s Estate.

credentials and cannot have been the only way to become a candidate. An estate-owner might as well look to fellow-Iranians who had a familiarity with the conditions in a given region that came from actual local administrative experience. The more such estate-owners were absentee, the more they absolutely depended on the skill of people drawn from the *in situ* administrative *cadre*. To regard that *cadre* as falling into hermetically sealed public and private sectors would also be a category error.<sup>283</sup>

line 1 *šlh* 'ly, "sent (word) to me". The interlinear correction may seem less than vital, since the text makes complete sense without it. That it was made is perhaps a tribute to the scribe's sense of *šlh* 'ly *kn* 'mr (cf. A6.6:2, A6.8:1, A6.11:1) as an epistolary *cliché* that should not be accidentally truncated. But there is also a substantive issue: omitting it might seem to imply that Miçapāta was at Virafsha's side, and precluding that false impression was a matter of accuracy. (Of course, *kn* 'mr would have been inadequate in *that* case too, since the word *bznh* should have appeared as well, as in A6.3:2, A6.13:1: cf. also A6.10:3, where "I have heard here" entails "[someone] said to me here".) *Šlh* duly re-appears in lines 5,8 below in connection with Miçapāta's further complaints.

lines 1-5 *The Cilician episode* Whitehead (like Driver) restored a figure 5 (not 10) at the end of line 2 and understood the situation thus (1974, 101-102). There are two incidents. (1) On the authorisation of letter from Arshama, Psamshek gave five Cilicians to Miçapāta, the *pqyd* of Virafsha. This happened in Babylon. (2) Nakhtḥor failed to give five Cilicians to Miçapāta, presumably in Egypt. The same Arshama authorisation is regarded by Miçapāta and Virafsha as applying on this second occasion, and in relation to a different five Cilicians. Nakhtḥor's failure to co-operate might have been justified on the grounds (a) that Psamshek was no longer *pqyd* or (b) that the letter only applied to transfers in Babylon or that (c) it only applied to the original five Cilicians. The problem with all of this is that, whatever we say about the others, this final justification alone seems so obviously valid that it is hard to see how Virafsha and Miçapāta could possibly claim otherwise.

To evade that problem one tries to envisage the situation as one in which the original promise/instruction was for delivery of ten Cilicians, of whom only five had so far been forthcoming. This would be quite easy if the first numeral in line 2 could be ten; but, since the parchment shows [x+]1, that is impossible. Porten-Yardeni's restoration of the numeral 10 at the end of line 2 (followed by Lindenberger and in this edition) is intended to produce the right effect by different means (being understood as the total number of Cilicians that *should* have been delivered), but it still leaves Miçapāta's reported message ill-formulated, since he inescapably says that five were to be given and that five were given. Lindenberger's translation of 2-3 adds some words that are not in the original -- "he [sc. Psamshek] gave me five *additional* Cilicians in Babylon – [ten] men in all. Later, Nakhtḥor was asked for *the other* five Cilician men, but he did not give them to me" (my italics) – but, although this is partly informed by line 5 (with *štr mn*, "apart from", glossed as "over and above") this does not really clarify the situation to any great degree: indeed "additional" seems the wrong word (or the right word, but in the wrong place). At this point it is more a question of what has already been given (to which something might then be added later): hence our suggestion that "already" is to be understood in the statement about what was given (that word itself being a restoration) in Babylon. But the

<sup>283</sup> The fact that the estate-managers of Queen Parysatis used the title *\*vaçabara-lustarbaru* (Stolper 1985, 63; Stolper 2006a, 465; Jursa 2011, 168) is a marker of relatively high status and membership of an ethnically diverse category of "königlichen Beamten oder königsnahen Personen" (Jursa 2011, 170). For further details about Babylonian holders of this title see Henkelman 2003, 162-165, Jursa 2011, 168-171, Tolini 2011, 1.508,512.

truth is that we can only satisfactorily get the desired result by postulating that, although the scribe wrote the numeral 5 in the middle of line 2, he *should* have written 10.

Even with that amendment the difficulties are not quite at an end, since Virafsha's instruction to Nakht̥hor in lines 3-4 also fails to express the situation with perfect clarity. Here, too, it should say that Arshama's letter was about giving Virafsha ten Cilicians and then go on to demand the delivery of five in addition to the five already delivered in Babylon. Instead it only speaks of Arshama promising five Cilicians. Perhaps the scribe simply made the same mechanical mistake as in line 2 again. Or perhaps we can imagine that Virafsha actually expressed himself badly: primarily concerned about the 5 Cilicians he had *not* got despite Arshama's instructions, he carelessly described the instructions as though they related just to those five persons before (so to say) correcting himself by distinguishing between the missing five and the five handed over in Babylon. But, if there can be a mistake in Virafsha's instruction to Nakht̥hor in lines 4-5, perhaps there can be a mistake in his summary of the situation in lines 1-3 (i.e. in his report of the content of a message to him from Miçapāta). The point may not be that the scribe should have written 10 in the middle of line 2, but that Virafsha should have said 10 (but actually said 5, which the scribe then dutifully wrote down) – a carelessness perhaps prompted by the (now irrecoverable) terms in which Miçapāta's message was actually framed.

That the mistake is repeated (line 2 and line 4) may seem worrying: solving a problem by postulating two mistakes is inelegant. But the alternative (i.e. the scenario as Whitehead envisaged it) is sufficiently awkward to warrant even a quite messy solution, and the epistolary trope of parallel report and instruction does mean that the repetition of a mistake is not quite as messy a situation as might first appear. That said, it remains true that this part of the letter is not well put together.

line 1 *Bbl...mn* 'Ršm, "in Babylon...from Aršama". This must mean Arshama was in Babylon at the time, a place where we also find him in A6.13 (cf. A6.14). Whether he is there at the time Virafsha writes to Nakht̥hor is another matter, and one on which the obscurity of the affair of the Cilician slaves (see above) does not make it any easier to get a purchase. But the association of the start of that affair with a letter to Psamshek does appear to put it some time in the past – assuming that we regard him as having now been succeeded by Nakht̥hor, just as Psamshek had succeeded his father Ankhohapi.

lines 1,2 *Bbl*, "in Babylon". cf. A6.12:1 n., and contrast line 5 below (*bBb'l*). We discern here a visit of Arshama's *pqyd* to Babylon: cf. line 7 below and A6.13:4 for anticipated trips there by Nakht̥hor, and 6.5:3 n. for other journeys to and from Arshama.

line 1 *Hlkyn*, "Cilicians". See A6.7:2-5 n. Notice that Cilicians are available to Arshama in Babylon: the role of Cilicians in the Bodleian letters need not be a specifically *Egyptian* fact.

line 2 *Pšmk br 'h̥hpy*, "Psamshek son of Ankhohapi". Nakht̥hor's predecessor (A6.3:1 etc.). The first of Virafsha's complaints touches on a matter left over from the previous *pqyd*'s period of office. On the use of the patronym see A6.6:2 n. Once again, as in A6.10, there is an element of contrast between the qualities of Psamshek and Nakht̥hor – though, if the circumstances are interpreted as above, Psamshek had not in fact produced all the Cilicians he was supposed to.

line 3 'hr, "after". See A6.7:6,7 n.

line 3 š'l, "he asked". What one expects is š'lt = "I asked", which Driver restored (as an emendation).

line 3 *Ḥlky*, “Cilicians”. Or “the Cilicians” (so Driver, Whitehead, Grelot)?

line 4 *hzy 'grt... 'l Psmšk*, “look at the letter...to Psamshek”. Taken literally this assumes that Nakhtḥor has access to a copy of the letter at which he can look (Whitehead 1974, 27, who infers that, if the Bodleian letters represent an archive *proprie dictum*, it is the *pqyd*'s archive). Or perhaps *hzy* means just “pay attention to”, and Virafsha is assuming that his assertion is good enough evidence that a letter had existed.

line 5 *bBb'l*, “in Babylon”. In contrast to elsewhere (cf. A6.12:1 n.) Babylon is here preceded by a preposition. It is also spelled with an medial aleph, by contrast with lines 1-2 (*Bbl*), but as in A6.13:5, A6.14:3.

line 5-6 *ḥmr'... Nḥṯḥwr lqh*, “the wine...Nakhtḥor has taken”. OSV is a rare word order in (Egyptian) Aramaic:<sup>284</sup> see Muraoka & Porten 2003, 307, citing otherwise only A3.10:1, A4.7:1 (in greetings formulae<sup>285</sup>), A4.7:30 (an emphatic statement of Arshama's complete ignorance about the destruction of the Elephantine temple), C1.1:21,62,66 (Aḥiqar), to which one may add D17.1, the Syene garrison-commander's dedication (“this *brzmdn*' PN the *rb ḥyl* of Syene made”).<sup>286</sup> These other cases are mostly ones in which the object plainly deserves some stress, and the same applies in A6.15 inasmuch as object fronting highlights a new subject in the litany of complaint.<sup>287</sup> The same thing actually occurs at lines 8-9 (*grd'... zy mr'ty kts w nksn lqh*, “the *garda* of my lady he assaulted and goods he took”), though in the absence of an expressed subject this simply exemplifies an OV word order.<sup>288</sup>

line 5-6 *ḥmr' zy bPprm*, “the wine which is in Papremis (?)”. Wine is regularly designated by the GN of its place of origin, and you do not have to visit Bordeaux to steal an English aristocrat's claret. So is there any guarantee that Virafsha is talking about (a) wine appropriated at some GN rather than (b) wine-of-GN appropriated somewhere else? If the third to seventh letters of line 6 are read as *b* + GN, we have “the wine that is in GN” and (a) is the preferable option. Otherwise we have “wine of GN” and option (b) becomes possible.

line 6 *bPprm*, “in Papremis(?)”. Driver seems to have regarded the reading *pprm* as pretty uncontroversial. But Whitehead underlines it, indicating some doubt (though the precise force of underlining seems not to be explained either at p.28 or in the abbreviations list to which reference is made on p.28); and Porten-Yardeni suggest that it we might also have *ydkm* - or presumably indeed any combination of the relevant letters, provided only that the final one is *m*. (The problem is that there is a small gap in the parchment in the lower part of the relevant

---

<sup>284</sup> Missed by Folmer 1995, 524, who says that OSV is absent in the Arshama correspondence (cf. 535) -- a term that, for linguistic purposes, can properly apply to all the Bodleian letters, not just those where Arshama is addressor (as Folmer recognizes when using A6.15 as an example of “official correspondence” at 551, 559 and elsewhere).

<sup>285</sup> Probably also to be restored in A3.1:1-2, A3.5:1, A3.6:1, A3.9:1, A4.1:1, A4.2:1, A4.3:2, A4.8:1-2, A6.1:1-2, D7.35:1-2, CG 277:2-3

<sup>286</sup> At Memphis (KAI 268), Keseçek Köyü (KAI 258, Gibson 1975, no.33, Lemaire at <http://www.achemenet.com/pdf/arameens/cilicie05.pdf>) and Limyra (KAI 262, Lemaire at <http://www.achemenet.com/pdf/arameens/lycie05.pdf>) we have OVS.

<sup>287</sup> Adjusting for lexically determined exceptions, SOV is arguably the dominant word-order in Arshama's correspondence (Folmer 1995, 533,543, 551, 575-576), so the present sentence can properly be seen as a simple example of object-fronting for stress.

<sup>288</sup> There are no examples of OSV in the Bactrian letters, but also very few sentences where the question might arise. OV occurs in A1:9,11, A2:5, A4:5, A5:1, A6:3-4

letters. The *b* and *m* are largely unaffected and reasonably certain.) Among the potential alternative readings *bydkm* could theoretically be treated as an Aramaic phrase and translated as “in your possession” – though since the plural “your” (*km*) would be unexpected (the remark is being made by Miçapāta to the singular Virafsha) this interpretation would present problems. Papremis has probably occurred to editors as a possibility (and been universally accepted as a reading) particularly readily because of its historical familiarity (see below).

Papremis was a city of the western Delta (Hdt.2.59,63,71, 165),<sup>289</sup> and site of Inaros’ defeat of Achaemenes at the start of the mid fifth c. Egyptian rebellion.<sup>290</sup> There is a problem about precise location. Suggestions include:

- Kherbeta = Andrupolis: Bresciani 1972, 299-303. She claims Papremis = \*Pa-p3-rmt, but Ray objects that latter would be Papromis in Greek (cf. Hdt.2.143 on *piromis* = *p3-rmt*).
- Sekhem = Letopolis: Altenmüller 1964, 271-9. This is based on explaining Papremis as Pa-p3-rm(wy), where *rmwy* is the name of a canal associated with the Sakhebu area in P.Westcar 9.16-18, but seems to be ruled out by P.Oxy. 1380:22 (see below).
- Nome 7, Lower Egypt: Lloyd 1975-1988, II 271, III 188. Lloyd eschews specification of a precise site but has the Papremite nome correspond in whole or part to the 7<sup>th</sup> of Lower Egypt in the NW Delta. This is based on P.Oxy. 1380:22, which mentions *Pephremis* [*sic*] between the Gynaecopolite nome (opposite Naucratis) and Buto<sup>291</sup> and immediately invalidates Altenmüller’s view, since Letopolis is near the apex of the Delta. The available canonical nomes are 3, 6 and 7; in favour of 7 is that the hippopotamus cult of Papremis (Hdt.2.71) would be in place there (Borchardt 1904, 86). It is admitted that no city of this nome has a name remotely resembling Papremis. (He does not refer to the putative reference to the place in A6.15.)
- Sachebu: Ray 1981, 58. N. of Letopolis, S. of Terenuthis = Kom Abu Billo. Sachebu has no known Greek name unlike other suggestions -- and no known second Egyptian name either (Late Period towns regularly had a hieroglyphic and a vernacular name) – and its association with Re‘-Horus might account for Herodotus idea of Ares having a cult in Papremis. Ray was aware that P.Oxy.1380 might be a problem for Altenmüller’s view – hence his selection of another place that is in broadly the same region and so consonant with Altenmüller’s Pa-p3-rm(wy). He does not comment on Lloyd’s suggestion, which is incompatible with his own conclusion.

One thing in favour of reading *Pprm* (Papremis) is that vineyards were indeed a feature of the western Delta (Meyer 1986, 1169,1173).<sup>292</sup>

<sup>289</sup> I discount Nibbi’s suggestion (1985 79, 90) that Papremis was between Heliopolis and Bubastis, which is based on a methodologically flawed assumption that Ctesias’ Byblos can be equated with = Papremis, and Salmon’s revival (1965, 144-146) of an old claim of E.Sourdille (1910, 88-95), that Papremis was identical with Pelusium at the eastern extremity of the Delta, which takes resistance to the multiplication of entities to an absurd degree.

<sup>290</sup> For those inclined to a date for the Bodleian letters not long after the Inaros revolt of the 450s (see Introduction p.41), the reference to Papremis – albeit for wine rather than fighting – has special resonance.

<sup>291</sup> The proximity of Gynaecopolis to Naucratis comes from Strab.803, and it may be at Kom Firin, near Delingat, 10 miles SW of Naucratis: Lloyd I 25 n.99.

<sup>292</sup> Athen.33DE reports that the wine was particularly good from Anthylla, the place given to Persian queens for their *zone*. Other appreciations of Delta wines: Strab.17.1.4, Plin.14.75. In pre-Greco-Roman times wine (always red: Meyer 1986, 1175) also came from Memphis and the oases, but not from other parts of the country.

line 6 *'bwr*, “grain”. The generic word for cereal crops (cf. A2.2, A3.8, A3.10, B2.8, B2.9, B3.13, B4.3, B4.4, C3.14, C3.28, D6.8 (fr.c), D7.2, D7.56), applicable to barley, emmer or wheat. It is most likely to be barley or emmer (cf. 6.9:3 n.) but there is no way of knowing which: even if the grain here comes from Persian-owned estates, that offers no guarantee in favour of one type or another (what was grown might be dictated by historical practice and in any case, on Persepolitan evidence, Persians valued barley and emmer equally).

line 6 *'rqt*, “of the lands”. *'rq* and *'r* are used of specific lots of land (B2.2-2.4, B3.4:5, D2.10) but also more generically of land (“sow the land with salt”: D23.1 Va:13), the ground (“demolish to the ground” [A4.7:9 // A4.8:8], “from the ground upwards” [B2.1:5]) or the earth (“Heaven and Earth” [A1.1], “what he has on the face of the earth” [B2.6:19], “tread the earth as a free man” [A1.1:92]).<sup>293</sup> In the present case the plural number entails that the sense is “the plots of land”, but whether the reference is intentionally specific (i.e. “the plots of land that constitute my estate”) or generic (“the plots in which grain is habitually grown”) is hard to say. Lindenberger’s translation (“field grain”) presumably opts for the latter. (I am not sure I understand his proposed alternative translation [2003, 105] “seed grain”.)

line 6 *'bd lnpšh*, “made (it over) to himself”. The accusation is of personal appropriation, not e.g. of making it over to Arshama’s estate (cf. A6.10:3,7). (Fittingly, Virafsha’s contrasting instruction is that the grain and wine, when returned, will be made over to *his* estate: line 7.) A similar turn-of-phrase (always in conjunction with *lqh*) occurs in A4.5:18 (probably), A4.7:13 // A4.8:11-12 and B7.2:6, and Benveniste 1954, 305 (followed by Rundgren 1957, 400, Driver 1965, 83, Whitehead 1978, 134) detected a calque of OP (*h*)*uvāpaišiyam akunauš*.<sup>294</sup> Whether the existence of a somewhat similar phrase in a late sixth c. Demotic text (*i.ir-f n-f n hp* = “has made over to himself by law”: Hughes 1958, 5 [line 7]) rules this out is moot. Yaron’s view, to the contrary, was that the Demotic phrase also reflected Persian usage (Yaron 1961, 128).<sup>295</sup>

line 6 *k't*, “now”. Although the report + response structure continues, the other two response sections (6-8, 9-12) start just with “now” and omit the phrase “Virafsha says thus” which appeared in line 3.

line 7 *t'th bznh*, “when you come to this (place)”. It is impossible to know whether a specific trip is already anticipated or Virafsha is simply making the assumption that sooner or later Arshama’s *pqyd* will have to visit him in Babylon.

line 8 *zyny*, “damages”. Iranian *\*zyāni-*, “loss, damage” (Tavernier 2007, 445). The use of a loan-word is perhaps a sign that we are dealing with a quasi-legal technical term.

line 8 *tšt'l*, “you will be questioned”. See A6.8:3 n. Virafsha’s confidence on this point presumes Arshama’s willingness, for which D6.7 frag.g:1 can reasonably be adduced as independent evidence.

line 8 *grd'...zy mr't'*, “the personnel of my lady”. The association of workers (see A6.10:1 n.) with Virafsha’s wife (the natural identification of “my lady”) would be no surprise: there is

<sup>293</sup> Possible occurrences in CG 118, 121 bis are of unclear reference.

<sup>294</sup> cf. DB §12, *uvāipašiyam akutā* (“made his own”), of Gaumata seizing the kingdom – so also (as in Aramaic) with a negative overtone.

<sup>295</sup> An Assyrian turn of phrase in which someone acquires something “under the shadow [sc. of the king]” and “makes it into his own estate” (Postgate 1969, nos.9-12) is a rather more remote parallel.

abundant evidence from Persepolis and Babylonia that women of the elite class had estates and, therefore, the human and other appurtenances that went with them.<sup>296</sup> In the present case there is the slight problem that in the next line Virafsha describes the *grd'* in question as his (*grd' zyly*). Did the *pqyd* misrepresent the situation because Virafsha's workers happened to have been doing something that specifically related to his wife? Or do we have here a piece of Achaemenid elite male chauvinism?

line 9 *nksn*, “goods”. cf. A6.10:1 n.

line 9 *'bydh l' 'yty lk*, “it is no business of yours”. See A6.7:9 n. It may seem odd that Virafsha does not respond more directly to the specific accusation that Nakhthor “assaulted” (*ktš*) the *grd'*?<sup>297</sup> Perhaps he is unconcerned for their personal hurt (as they are mere workers); and/or perhaps he assumes that, had any of them been sufficiently harmed to be rendered unfit for work, Miçapata would have said so.

line 11 *qbylt...yšlh*, “send a complaint”: cf. A6.8:3 n.

---

<sup>296</sup> For some specific associations of elite women and *kurtaš* see PF 1236, 2049 PFNN 0279 (Irtašduna), PF 849, 1002, 1005, 1028, 1029, 1041-1043, 1098, 1109, 1198 and many more texts in the PFNN series (Irdabama). For the wider context of workers associated with Achaemenid royal ladies cf. Brosius 1996.

<sup>297</sup> The term connotes fairly robust violence in B7.2:5,9, B8.4:5, B8.6:10. (D2.32 fr.a:2, b:2 are too fragmentary to tell.)

## A6.16 = Driver 13 = Grelot 74 = Lindenberger 48

### Artahaya on the delivery of goods

#### Summary

Artahaya complains that Nakhtor has sent unwanted goods

#### Date

None given.

#### Text

The parchment consists of three separate fragments. The Porten-Yardeni edition differs from Driver's in postulating a larger gap between the main fragment and that to its left, resulting in additional restored letters within the latter part of lines 1-3 -- three in line 1 ([*'n*]t), four in line 2 ([*hyty*]), and four in line 3 ([*hdyt*]). They are clearly right about this: Driver behaved as though the two fragments virtually joined, which they plainly do not. Considerations of symmetry also argue for more space for writing both before and after the end of lines 2-5 than Driver assumed. (Enough remains of the left-hand fragment to show that the writing in line 1 did not extend as far to the left as in subsequent lines; and the start of line 1 is reliably restorable.) This has significant impact at the join of lines 3 and 4 (see n. below) and leaves an unrestorable gap in lines 4-5, where Driver produced a continuous text. Lindenberger follows Porten-Yardeni, with the usual slight variations about square brackets. (He also does not print Porten-Yardeni's restorations in lines 2,3 and 4, though they are reflected in his translation.

#### Structure of letter

The letter is not constructed on the binary report-and-message model so prevalent elsewhere in the Bodleian letters. Perhaps this corresponds to the fact that (although there are turns of phrase that recur in more formal letters: see note on lines 1-2) we may here be dealing with a particularly private piece of correspondence. (Admittedly any abiding uncertainty as to whether the letter is criticizing or praising Nakhtor makes assessment of its character a delicate matter.) There were perhaps other such things in the *cache*: D6.13, in which someone-- might it be a *pqyd*? -- apparently writes to his sister Eswere (though the name of Arshama was mentioned too), is designated by Porten-Yardeni as a "fragmentary private letter".

line 1 *'Rthy*, "Artahaya". See A6.10:10 n. If this is the same as the subscript-official in A6.10, we note that he addresses Nakhtor in the present letter quite respectfully -- which is specially striking if he is actually complaining about Nakhtor's actions, as Porten supposes. This may have some implications for the status of the *pqyd*. See A6.4:2 n.

line 1 *šlm...lk*. On greetings formulae cf. A6.3:1 n.

line 1-2 *'ntšh* [...] *kn 'bd kzy ... tḥdy*, "be diligent [...] in order that...you should please..." Driver read/restored *b[šbwty w]kn* at the start of line 2 ("in [my affair and]"), which makes good enough sense but presupposes a *b* at the beginning of the line that is not frankly visible on the parchment. On the analogy of A6.14:3-4 ("be diligent and make an order to my official so that the revenue of those domains he should bring to me to Babylon. Act thus in order that you might place me") we should expect an imperative instruction in the lacuna (between "be

diligent” and “act thus...”). But even at its maximum length the lacuna hardly leaves room for a complex instruction; and, since Yardeni’s drawing suggests that the end of line 1 (after “be diligent”) contained nothing, there may be at most a couple of words missing. (It could, so far as space is concerned, be something as anodyne as *wbkl ‘dn*, “and at all times”.) The instruction to be diligent recurs not only in A6.14 (where Lindenberger turns “be diligent and make an order” into “give strict instructions”) but also in A6.10:5 (cf. 4) and a characteristically damaged and opaque ostrakon (CG J10:6). The verb (*nšh*) is also used in the Aramaic DB of Darius himself (C2.1:3.4) and his helpers (C2.1:11.75). See below 4-5 n., and in an unclear context in Saqqara 82.

line 2 *l’lhy’ wl’ršm tḥdy* “please the gods and Arshama”. Whitehead 1974, 110 contrasts Varuvahya’s instruction to Nakhtḥor just to “gladden me” (A6.14:3-4) and infers that Artahaya is of lower status. The conclusion is likely (Varuvahya is a prince, Artahaya is presumed to be a bureaucratic official), and the turn of phrase is doubtless consistent with this.

line 2 *l’lhy*, “the gods”. Driver, after Eilers 1936, 161-169, claimed “the gods” here and in the phrase *’lhy’ šlm yšmw lk* (may the gods grant you peace) in line 5 (below) and in A6.6:1 might really mean “(kingly) majesty”, on the grounds that *’lhy’* is a Pahlavi ideogram for *bagan* = majesty.<sup>298</sup> Grelot accepted Driver’s view in the present line, though he treated l.5 as referring to the gods and had no occasion to comment on A6.6. Whitehead 1974, 249-250 doubted the claim about the Pahlavi ideogram (on the grounds that Nyberg 1964/74 did not mention it), and asserted that “gods” means what it says. It surely does in the peace-wishes in A6.6:1 and A6.16:5 (the interconnection with other greetings formulae makes this the natural assumption, even if A6.16:5 comes at the end not the start of a latter), and it is hard to feel convinced it does not do so in the present place as well.

It is certainly true that in Sasanian times the king could be described as *bay* (MP), *bay* (Parth.) or *theos* and as “born from divine family” (*kē čīhr az yazdān* [MP], *kēčīhr aš yazdān* [Parth.], *ek genous theon*) – though he was never called *yazad* (MP) or *yazd* (Parth.) (cf. Rollinger 2011, 21). Eilers claimed that the phenomenon went back at least to Hellenistic Persis, this being the alleged explanation of the words *zy ’lhy’* on certain coins. More precisely, coins from Baydad to Vadafrad I have *frtrk zy ’lhy’*. Humbach claimed that this meant “*fratarak* of the god”, with “god” referring to the king. Wiesehöfer 1994, 136 was prepared to contemplate this, but on the basis that Antiochos III had introduced (retrospective) ruler cult, so that “gods” referred to him and his Seleucid predecessors. Since the \$64,000 question is whether whatever post-Achaemenid evidence there may be *does* cast any light on Achaemenid conditions, the availability of this explanation of the Hellenistic material renders it valueless. The case has to be made on Achaemenid evidence.

Eilers’s Achaemenid evidence consisted in the phrases *bagani’ Dariamuš šarru ina muhhika* (CT 22.74) and *bagani Darimuš šarru ina muhhikunu* (CT.22.244), wherein *bagani*(’) might be derived from OP *baga-* = “god”. The earlier view was the phrase (only attested in these passages<sup>299</sup>) meant “the command of King Darius is over you”, carrying an

<sup>298</sup> He also compared the formula “gods/king and Arshama” with the *dšn* given by “the king and by me [Arshama]” in A6.4: but this passage in itself does nothing to countenance the interpretation of “gods and Arshama”.

<sup>299</sup> But used by two different authors - Guzanu (*šangu* of Sippar and then *šākin tēmi* of Babylon: presumably the latter in the present letter) and ?Ubar (not identified) - so it is not simply an idiolectal quirk. On the other hand there is conceivably a substantive link between the letters if the Bagavīra mentioned in CT 22.244 and known as a *rab birtu* in BM 54205 were identified with the *rab dūri* in CT 22.74. But that is a very long shot.

implicit threat, should the addressee not behave in the appropriate fashion. Eilers objected that there are other OP words for “command” and that the absence of *ša* between *bagani* and the king’s name rules out the translation “{something} of Darius”. Hence the suggestion, inspired by Sasanian evidence for *bag* as a royal designation, that it means “Majestät Darius, der König, ist über dich/Euch” (1936, 182, 187).<sup>300</sup> This interpretation was accepted by Ebeling (1949, 45, 130) and is reflected in translations of CT 22.74 by Abrahams 2004, 369 (“royal dignity”) and Joannès 1982, 24 and 1990, 187 n.60 (“majesté”). The view of CAD (B 28 s.v. *bagani*), on the other hand is that it means “curse?” (the word being described curtly as an Aramaic loan-word),<sup>301</sup> and that translation is found in Oppenheim 1967, 143 (cited in Briant 2002, 342).<sup>302</sup>

Functionally speaking, the phrase (conceived as a threat of royal punishment) recalls a much more common one (found in Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid texts referring to a variety of contexts) which alludes to people “bearing punishment of the king” (*hītu ša šarri šadādu* or *zebēlu*) – and not only the king but also variously of the gods, the gods and the king, Gobryas (Cyrus’ satrap of Babylonia), the city (once: uncertain) and even Nabu-šarru-usur, the *ša reš šarri bēl piqitti* of Eanna (acting in a private context). These are thoroughly discussed in Kleber 2008, 68-71, who lists 62 relevant texts (and there are more) but does not broach the question of *bagani’ Dariamuš*. CT 22.244 involves *dullu ša šarri* (royal work) and 22.74 is about a dispute about military forces; both deal with issues in which the threat of royal punishment is entirely appropriate.

Another parallel to consider might be the “word” (*amat*) of the king – a concept of wide currency in Assyrian and Babylonian texts, including contexts where to “speak the word of the king” is to invite the king to settle a dispute by issuing a definitive order.<sup>303</sup> A particularly interesting text is TuM 2/3 261.9 (from year 22 of an unidentified king), where we find *amat šarri ina muḥḥika* (“the word of the king is upon you”) – the same formula as in CT 22.74,244, with *amat* instead of *bagani*. In TuM 2/3 261 the context is relatively mundane (a loan of money and the pawning of a slave), and the royal word may represent a judicial determination consequent upon appeal. So the situation is not particularly like that of the *bagani’ Dariamuš* texts, but it illustrates a locution that may have some bearing on those texts.

The rarity of *bagani’ Dariamuš* does suggest that, if not a single author’s idiolect (see n.294), it was for some reason only very passingly fashionable. It certainly does not appear that the Assyriological community has yet decisively resolved the problem of the word’s meaning or slight incidence in surviving texts. CAD postulates an Aramaic origin but does not seek to identify it more closely. Tavernier 2007 perhaps agrees, since he does not acknowledge *bagani* as an Iranian loanword, but, since he does not even let it into his *Incerta*, he offers no comment on the matter.

Whatever the upshot, however, these two early Achaemenid Babylonian texts would be scant reason to take Artahaya’s words to Nakthor at anything but face-value. For a different formula conjoining gods and an authority figure that may have at least as good a chance of being (albeit distantly) relevant cf. “may your *širi* be made by the gods and the King”, i.e. “may your wishes be fulfilled by the gods and the king” (PF 1832, 1857-1860, 2079, PFNN 394, PFNN 0702, PFNN 2544) – a piece of *politesse* used only in letters (on rectangular

<sup>300</sup> Eilers 1936, 184 debates whether this signifies “Majestät Dareios, der König, ist hinter Euch her, gibt auf Euch acht” or “Majestät Dareios komme über Euch” / “Vor Majestät Dareios nehme ich Euch beim Wort”, but in any event it is threatening.

<sup>301</sup> Oddly Abrahams refers her readers to CAD, without noting that its view on the word differs from the one she incorporates in her translation.

<sup>302</sup> Schmidl 2012, 113 just has “ich berufe mich bei König Darius gegen dich”.

<sup>303</sup> Note also “word of the king” in B1.1 (“except for the word of the king” meaning “unless a royal *diktat* prevents it”).

tablets) sent among officials or from officials to superiors, not on letter orders to inferiors (Henkelman 2010, 670).

line 3 *thdw*. Driver postulates a non-Semitic name (but the preceding lacuna seems rather large for this to be the patronymic of Ana..., *pace* Grelot) or – reading *r* as the third letter -- a derivation from a postulated Aramaic borrowing of Egyptian *hrr* = “bundle” (after Cazelles 1955, 96-97). Lindenberger opts for *thrw* but offers no interpretation. Whitehead suggests *thdw* as a form of *hdy*, “you [plural!] will make me happy” or *thww* as pael of *hwy* = “show, notify”.

line 3 *gldy twlt'*, “skins of purple”. The colour is that of, or extracted from, worms: cf. CAD s.v. *tūltu* 1c and the Septuagint translation of Hebrew *twla'* with *kokkinos* (Isaiah 1.18) or *kokkos* (Lam.4.5). For *gld* see D7.5 (= CG 228), where it also refers to a commodity. Red sheep-skins of unstated purpose appear in YOS 3.195 = NBbBU 195; there is also talk of the “darkening” of skins (for which cf. BIN 1.26 = NBbBU 226). Both Driver and Whitehead canvass the possibility that these might be for writing-parchment (Driver citing Arab evidence for the dyeing/perfuming of such things). On the other hand, alongside a reference to a linen-tunic (*ktn*, cognate with Greek *χίτων*), the use of coloured leather to make shoes (Herod.*Mim.*7.25-27,58,61) may (as Driver notes) be pertinent. (One of the types of shoe is even called *kokkis*: 1.61.)

line 3-4 [*hyty 'ly zy l' h*]srt, “and [he brought to me what I was not la]cking”. Driver read the lacunose section at the line join as [*ly kl zy*] *hsrt* (“to me all that I lacked”: so too Grelot). Whitehead followed suit, save for preferring *mh* to *kl* (giving “...what I lacked”), on the parallel of *mh zy* in A6.15:8,9. Porten-Yardeni saw that the dimensions of the parchment entailed (or at least permitted) a longer gap, and suggested *w[hyty 'ly zy l' h]*srt (“and he brought to me what I did not lack”). This, together with (i) restoration of *l[.]* later in line 4 as *l'* (“not”) rather than *lk* (Driver, Whitehead) and (ii) replacement of Driver’s *l'l'* in line 3 (allegedly = “all right”, partly on the basis of an interpretation of *tl'* in B3.6:9 which no longer holds sway) with *lhn l' [hdyt]* (“but [I was] not [gladdened]”), entirely changes the import of the letter: Artahaya is now complaining – despite the fact that the latter part of line 4 (still) has him say that Nakhtḥor is praiseworthy. The gap at the join of lines 4 and 5 is rather large (after “...praiseworthy to me and” there is room for up to 18 letters, of which only four are at all preserved, in line 4 and a further three or four at the start of line 5 before the restored *kzy*), so it might theoretically have contained something substantive that cast light on this *prima facie* contradictory situation. Alternatively one must suppose that all of 4-5 conformed to the indications of approval of Nakhtḥor that we find in its preserved beginning and end (i.e. that Artahaya spent some time praising Nakhtḥor and wishing him well) and is meant to indicate that Artahaya does not blame him for what had not gladdened him – apparently the despatch of things that he did not need (instead, presumably, of some that he did). On this reading (a) Artahaya is being extremely complaisant to Nakhtḥor; and (b) it is assumed that Nakhtḥor will know what to do next (i.e. what things he *should* send) without being told anything more explicit than that he should be diligent so as to gladden the gods and Arshama. It has to be said that the parallels for the instruction to “be diligent” (cf. 1 n. above) create a peremptory impression that is not quite in keeping with this reading of the letter as a whole.

line 4 *ptstw*, “praiseworthy”. Iranian *\*patistāva-* “praiseworthy, praised” (Tavernier 2007, 406). It is striking that the Bodleian letters also produce Iranian loanwords for punishment and “bad report”. Lindenberger’s “You have always given me excellent service” makes more explicit

the supposition that writer is here contrasting historical satisfaction with current dissatisfaction.

line 5 *'lhy'*, "the gods". See above line 2 n.

## APPENDIX 1: LETTER SUBSCRIPTS

The subscripts in Aramaic letters from Egypt and Bactria have to be placed in the context of (very) similar phenomena in other documents from Egypt and Persepolis. Much of this material (though not the Bactrian items) was recently discussed together by Tavernier 2008, who rightly stressed the desirability of dealing with the Persepolitan material (much the most voluminous) in the light of that from elsewhere.<sup>304</sup> His conclusion was that the subscripts (which are overwhelmingly associated with letters) disclose a procedure for creating a letter in one or more languages other than Old Persian that – expressed in terms of the phraseology of Persepolitan letters but applicable *mutatis mutandis* elsewhere -- runs as follows:

- An official dictates an order (*\*patigama*) in OP to PN(1)
- PN(1) “delivers the order” to PN(2) who makes an Aramaic version
- PN(2) gives this Aramaic version (the *dumme*) to PN(3) -- who thus “receives the *dumme* from PN(2)”
- PN(3) “writes” (*tallišta*) an Elamite or Demotic version of the *dumme*.

It is explicitly left unclear whether PN(2) also creates the Elamite or Demotic version, so that PN(3) is merely an appropriate copyist, or PN(3) actually creates the translation (as well as writing it down). At the earlier stage it is presumably the function of PN(1) to articulate the wishes of the official in a specific verbal form, so that PN(2) can render it into Aramaic. (Tavernier’s use of “dictate” for what the official does is therefore rather misleading. If anything, it is PN(1) who dictates to PN(2).)

### Data

The directly relevant data may be summarized as follows.

The final part of A6.2 contains the following elements:

- “Anani the scribe (*spr*) *b’l t’m*, Nabu-‘aqab wrote (*ktb*)” (23-24).
- “Sasobek wrote” (25): this is written in Demotic.
- “Nabu-‘aqab the scribe” appears in date/scribe lines (28)

A6.8-13 have a regular formula and occasional Demotic annotations:

- PN(1) knows this order, PN(2) is the scribe (*spr*).
  - PN(1) is Bagasrava (6.8,9) or Artahaya = Artavahya (6.10,11,12,14)
  - PN(2) is Ahpepi (6.8) or Rashta (6.9,10,11,12,14)
- Demotic annotations
  - A6.11 (external: a subject summary)
  - A6.12 and 13 (external: the word “Hotephep”)

It is clear that “PN(2) is scribe” does not entail that PN(2) actually wrote the document, since not all Rashta ones are in same hand. The presence of a third person (the actual writer) is therefore implied.

We find much the same in the Bactrian letters, except that the “scribe” and the person “who knows this order” are usually the same individual

- A1:12 Hashavakhshu the scribe knows this order
- A2:7 Daizaka is scribe and Athifya knows this order
- A3:3-4 [...]the scribe knows this order
- A4:6 Daizaka the scribe knows this order
- A5:3 Nurafratara the scribe knows this order

---

<sup>304</sup> For brief remarks on the subscripts in the Bactrian documents see Naveh & Shaked 2012, 23-24.

A5a:5 [...] knows this order  
A6:11 Nurafratara the scribe knows this order  
A7:2 Daizaka the scribe knows this order

P.Demot.Berl.13540 has the following formula

- PN(1) knows this order, PN(2) is he who wrote this letter, PN(3) wrote PN(1) has an Iranian name, PN(2) and PN(3) have Egyptian ones. It is agreed that there are linguistic signs that the Demotic text we now possess actually corresponds to/translates an Aramaic version that we do not possess.

The subscripts of a large number of PF documents (mostly, but not all, letters) have two or more of:

- “PN(1) delivered the order (*\*patigama*)”;
- “PN(3) received the draft (*dumme*) from PN(2)”;
- “PN(3) wrote (*tallišta*)”

Tavernier 2008, who provides a full list of relevant texts, labels these respectively as the P, D and T formulae. On one occasion (PF 1790) the first of these (P) is replaced by “PN(1) knew about this” – a phrase that immediately recalls the Bodleian letters, the Bactrian letters and the Demotic letter of Pherendates. In texts from Darius’ reign fewer than ten persons are recorded in P formulae, nearly 30 in D formulae and over 60 in T formulae. That may suggest the comparatively great individual importance of the P-individuals. It is true that in any one year there are generally two and occasionally three different persons on record doing the P-function (the two years producing only one person are years producing very few texts), but there is a strong correlation between particular P-individuals and particular principals (letter-writers or other points of reference: people like Parnakka or Ziššawiš), so this modest multiplicity does not perhaps seriously compromise the impression that, normally speaking, a single person controls delivery of orders for a particular high rank giver of orders.

Indirect reflections of formulae of this sort can be found in (at least) two places.

(1) One is straightforward: in the new Arshama document from Saqqara the phrase “Artahaya knows this order” appears, not as a subscript, but (apparently) as part of a reference in the body of a document to an earlier order.

(2) The other is slightly less so. Ezra 4.7,18 pictures a letter denouncing the Jews being sent to Artaxerxes by Rehum the *b’l t’m* and Shimshai the scribe (and by other officials in Samaria and Beyond the River); and 4.23 pictures Artaxerxes replying to Rehum and Shimshai, who then go to Jerusalem and make the Jews stop building. (Confusingly, initially in 4.7 the letter is actually said to be from Bishlam, Mithredath, Tabeel and the rest of their companions.)

The phrase *b’l t’m* appears (a) as an isolated phrase in a palimpsest Bactrian letter (which provides no useful substantive information) and (b) in the context of a subscript in A6.2: it is there attached to someone who is also entitled scribe, and this person is named alongside another person who (actually) wrote the document. On this showing *b’l t’m* is here functionally equivalent to the Aramaic formula about “knowing this order”. What inference should we draw from this? One possibility is that the compiler of Ezra has wrongly elevated names from an ordinary subscript line to the position of being among (indeed at the head of) the addressors of the letter (Lewis 1977, 10). The other possibility is that *b’l t’m* is a real and distinctive title, one that designates someone who is more important than those who ordinarily “know this order” (even if in A6.2 this high-ranking person is as a matter of fact carrying out the function of someone who “knows this order”), and that the bearer of this title

is a quite appropriate lead addressor of a letter to the King. The only external check on the question is provided by two Babylonian documents in which we encounter people (in the environment of the satrap of Babylon and Transeuphratene) with the title “scribe and *bēl tēmi*” (BM 74554) or *bēl tēmi* (Michigan 89). In the first case, where (moreover) *two* people are involved, we are not far at all from the world of the letter subscripts (the accumulation of titles exactly recalls ‘Anani in A6.2). In the second this is less clear, but I doubt that the text requires us to elevate the individual in question (he is described as a Mede, but his name is lost) to any significantly different level of importance. The view that *Ezra* 4.8 misuses an ordinary satrapal letter subscript can therefore stand. Insofar as *bēl tēmi* is a real title (and not just a phrase that means the same as “knows this order”) – and Michigan 89 *is* perhaps evidence for that (whereas BM 74554 is not)<sup>305</sup> – its holder’s function and status were heavily (though doubtless not exhaustively) defined by the function of order-transmission represented in the subscripts.

### Analysis

Various questions arise. The first is the significance of the Aramaic items in their own terms and how they relate to the annotations in Demotic and Elamite documents. The second and third are what the annotations signify procedurally and why it is necessary sometimes to include them in the document.

Implicit in A6.2 and the Bodleian letters are (a) the theoretical distinction between order-knower, scribe and actual writer, (b) the possible combination of the first two in one person<sup>306</sup>, and (c) the lack of necessity to mention the third. It is not internally obvious what the function of the non-writing “scribe” (i.e. the Rashta figure) might be; but one is looking for an executive / disseminating role that is grander than the mere copying of a particular document

The presence of various Demotic annotations in A6.2 and A6.11-13 must indicate the presence of Demotic scribes around the letter-producing process, and may well be best understood as a reflex of the existence of a Demotic version of the letter. “Sasobek wrote” is particularly close to that conclusion. One might wonder if “Ḥotepḥep” is short for “Ḥotepḥep wrote”. The annotation “the boat” on A6.2 and the subject summary on A6.11 show a Demotic writer engaging with the content of the letters.<sup>307</sup>

The Pherendates letter confirms the three-fold distinction implicit in the Aramaic texts: that is, we certainly see two other writing-related people in addition to the order-knower; there may be an issue about what they do (see below) but their separateness is undoubted. The Elamite texts also have a threefold distinction

- one heading (P formula) certainly corresponds to the order-knower in Egyptian and Bactrian documents
- another (T formula) must correspond to one of the other two Egyptian/Bactrian headings; establishing which depends on a view of the Elamite items *in se*. The answer turns out to be that the D formula logically precedes the T formula so, if scribe and actual writer are distinct (and they are), D must correspond to the “scribe” and T to the actual writer. Verbally speaking the implication statement that PN(2) creates a *dumme* is not quite parallel to the presence of writing-related words in the equivalent place in the Aramaic and Demotic model

<sup>305</sup> For another title containing *tēmi* cf. *šākin tēmi*, a city governor.

<sup>306</sup> One naturally assumes this in A6.2 and Bactrian documents show that it is a possibility.

<sup>307</sup> As a reverse example of this sort of annotatory reflex of a missing other version one might compare the report that the *verso* of P.Dem.Berl.23584 has the sender’s name in Aramaic.

So things ought to be straightforward. To be specific: the Persepolis and Pherendates items each provide three functions which can be matched off with one another: order-knower = P, he who wrote this letter = D and wrote = T. A6.2 has these three, but with the first two represented by a single person (‘Anani), the Bactrian and Bodleian letters only articulate the first two (in the Bactrian case often both done by one person),<sup>308</sup> but the third (the actual writer) is demonstrably implied in the Bodleian letters by the variable handwriting of texts associated with Rashta as “scribe”. But there are still some things that need to be addressed.

*The Demotic letter subscript.* The PN(2) figure in Pherendates’ (Demotic) letter, Peftuauneit, has an Egyptian name but by direct application of the parallel is responsible for producing an Aramaic text (Porten 2011, 297 n.16). We know there *was* an Aramaic version lying behind the Demotic text we have (Hughes 1984); and I have no problem with there being Egyptians who could understand OP and write in Egyptian and Aramaic. Alternatively, we assume that PN(2) actually made a Demotic translation from an Aramaic version that someone else had produced. In the Aramaic version of the letter that someone else would have been named as the PN(2) figure, whereas in the Demotic text Peftuauneit is named. The fact that a total of five persons have been involved in producing the two letters (Satibara, Peftuauneit, an unnamed Aramaic composer, Waḥibre, an unnamed Aramaic writer) does not have to be reported in both versions. Tavernier seems to take the second view, but he does not spell out the implication that the lost Aramaic version had some different names in its subscript. Nor does he spell out another implication. Seeing things in this way definitely locates the production of a non-Aramaic version at the level of PN(2): so it looks as though the choice Tavernier left open as to whether an Elamite/Demotic version was produced by PN(2) or PN(3) may best be decided in favour of the former option, leaving PN(3) as simply the writer of the actual document.

*A6.2 and the problem of Nabu‘aqab* In A6.2 the situation should be that ‘Anani is both order-knower and “scribe” while Nabu‘aqab writes the actual text. There is no problem with this both because the Bactrian letters show the order-knower/scribe function being done by one person and because at Persepolis the two functions are sometimes done by the same person, though on different occasions. Yet Tavernier 2008, 71 says that “it is more likely that ‘Anani drafted and wrote the letter himself, which could be the reason why he is called both *spr*’ and *b’l t’m*, while Nabû-‘aqab probably made another copy”. This is apparently not saying that ‘Anani does the “scribe” task that appears in the other Aramaic subscripts (i.e. turns text into Aramaic); rather it is taking *spr*’ to refer to actual writing. This seems unnecessary and no explicit explanation is advanced. Perhaps the explanation is this. Tavernier believes that the number of officials or functions mentioned in a subscript corresponds to the number of languages involved – three in PFT documents, but only two in Bodleian letters (and the Bactrian ones). In these terms A6.2 is awkward because, although we have two names (‘Anani and Nabu‘aqab), we have three functions, *b’l t’m*, scribe and writer; so Nabu‘aqab is sidelined by being treated as a sort of contingently supernumerary participant in the process.<sup>309</sup>

---

<sup>308</sup> Such combination of function can be compared with the fact that among Persepolitan functionaries Kameca, Varaza, Ribaya and Datena were all capable of both P and D activities, even if they do not perform them at the same time.

<sup>309</sup> Tavernier’s approach to the problem in an earlier unpublished version of the discussion was different, viz. to ignore Anani’s “scribe” title (presumably as a casual additional fact) and equate Nabu‘aqab with the person represented by the Persepolitan *dumme*-formula: this is apparent from the fact that PN *spr*’ and *ktb* are put in the table as alternative equivalents to the *dumme* formula. The argument for doing this is (presumably) that Nabu‘aqab is after all entitled “scribe” in line 28, and that is in the handwriting of the main letter. The insertion of his name with *ktb* in line 23 will be an attempt to note his “scribe” (i.e. translator) function. (It is an attempt that uses the wrong word – *ktb*

If this is the explanation, is it a good explanation? That is, is it a good reason for departing from the simplest way of making the phenomena match up? The main argument underlying Tavernier's position is presumably this: if those producing the Bodleian and Bactrian letters did not think it worth naming the mere mechanical writer of a letter, why should we assume that it is ever standard to mention such a person unless something more is involved than in those cases? The letters that always have a named writer (those from Persepolis) have the characteristic of being in Elamite (as well as at an earlier stage in Aramaic), whereas the Bodleian and Bactrian letters are only in Aramaic. So let us assume that the writer is named because he has to write in something other than Aramaic – and perhaps even (for preference) has to compose the document in that other letter, for that will allow us to assign him a substantive role. It is a neat idea (though I think it does rather heavily depend on making the Persepolitan T-formula individual a composer, not just a copyist, of Elamite – so Tavernier should not have left that choice open), but is it obviously so neat as to justify disrupting our reading of A6.2 and the Pherendates letter? It is better to go with the simplest amalgamation of the phenomena and accept that habits differed about the naming of the actual physical writer of a particular letter.<sup>310</sup>

However, we are not quite through with Nabu'aqab. The words "Nabu'aqab wrote" (23) are in a different hand from, and represent an addition to, the rest of the document. Nor is it the only (Aramaic) addition. Immediately before the demotic annotation ("Sasobek wrote" and "the boat") in 25-26 there is an Aramaic content-annotation in lines 24-25,<sup>311</sup> written in a very rough hand and apparently added by someone other than the person who added "Nabu'aqab wrote".<sup>312</sup> Moreover, the final word of this roughly written annotation is *ktb*; so the (now hardly legible<sup>313</sup>) annotation also perhaps once said something about the creation of the document.<sup>314</sup> But these additional facts do not add much to the basic Nabu'aqab problem, which is this: if Nabu'aqab is the actual writer of the main document, someone else added "Nabu'aqab wrote". This opens two possibilities.

- Initially A6.2 was formulated (as the Bodleian and Bactrian letters are) to mention just two functions, the ones known in the Bodleian and Bactrian letters as order-knower and scribe--though here the order-knower was called *b'l t'm* and he and the scribe were one and the same person (as in the Bactrian letters). Then, someone added the fact that the

---

means "he wrote" and should *prima facie* refer to the actual writing of the letter. But it recalls the way in which the putative scribe-translator is described in the demotic text as "he who wrote this letter"; and in legal contracts from Elephantine *ktb* sometimes effectively means "caused to be written": see below n.315.) I am slightly inclined to think this was actually a better way out of the problem than the one in the published version.

<sup>310</sup> PFT letters resolutely name the writer, whereas the P-formula disappears in Xerxes' reign (in PTT texts). The (later) Aramaic letters from Egypt and Bactria go the other way, if anything. The Pherendates letter (from Darius' reign) has all three components, like about 20% of the PFT letters.

<sup>311</sup> The Aramaic content-annotation is perhaps the same sort of thing we find on the outer side of Driver letters so far as content goes (cf. 6.4:6 n.); but here it is not clear that it was on a conveniently visible outer surface. Whitehead 1974, 157 says it was not. In any case we are dealing with a letter written on two sides of the papyrus, not one in which the "address" material is by itself on the verso

<sup>312</sup> Naveh 1970, 33 distinguishes lines 24-25 from (all of) the rest of the letter in terms of Aramaic palaeography, and everyone seems to agree that the lines are distinct. Unfortunately Naveh does not seem to comment specifically on the "Nabu'aqab wrote" annotation in 23 at any point.

<sup>313</sup> There *are* more letters visible in these lines than Porten-Yardeni venture to transliterate.

<sup>314</sup> It appears straight before the Demotic "Sasobek wrote". It is almost as though it is there for Sasobek then to fill his name in demotic as the subject of the verb (though he then also put *sh* = wrote!). But perhaps that is too speculative a notion.

letter's actual writer was Nabu'aqab -- a fact already noted in the address/date lines in the form "Nabu'aqab the scribe" (where "scribe" signified actual writing).<sup>315</sup>

- The other view would be that 'Anani's "scribe" title should be ignored, Nabu'aqab was actually the "scribe" (in Persepolitan terms the PN(2) figure) but his name was wrongly left out of line 23 and later put in by someone other than the main actual writer with a potentially misleading description of his function, viz. *ktb* ("he wrote").

On either view one of the descriptions of Nabu'aqab's role seems to be misleading. One might argue that the second view involves a marginally less misleading use, in that a case can be made that *ktb* does not always mean what it appears to say (Whitehead 1974, 27, 173).<sup>316</sup> But whether a usage found in contracts is plainly relevant here is arguable, and the second view involves the additional problem of explaining why 'Anani was called a "scribe" at all. (It has to become just a random piece of unneeded specification.) I think honours remain about even between the two views – leaving us where we started.

The question remains therefore whether or not one should go with the simplest way of making the phenomena from four different documents or sets of documents mutually consistent. I am inclined to think one should; and I certainly think that, if one nonetheless chooses to espouse Tavernier's reading of the evidence, one should be quite clear that one is making the opposite choice.

Letters subscripts are always associated with what we know or can reasonably assume to be satraps or satrap-level officials.<sup>317</sup> Moreover, when they appear in non-epistolary Persepolis documents, they are always associated either textually and/or *via* seals with exactly the same limited group of people.<sup>318</sup> Subscripts are absent for both higher status people (queens) and lower (but still important) status people (department heads). So the association is really rather specific. At the same time they do not *have* to appear when a

---

<sup>315</sup> Cowley floated the possibility that *ktb* = "wrote" occurred in the lost latter part of 1.27 and *Nbw'qb spr* (28) means "Nabu'aqab the document". This reading could probably fit either view of Nabu'aqab's status, given that "wrote the document" *could* stand for "acted as scribe-translator" (on analogy of Demotic "wrote this letter": cf. above n.309), though on the whole it would more easily favour the first view. But Porten-Yardeni's rejection of the reading (albeit unexplained) probably means there is no point in pursuing the issue.

<sup>316</sup> Contracts characteristically have both (i) a statement that PN1 wrote the document *lpm* or *'l pm* PN2 and (ii) a statement (in an endorsement on the *verso*) that the document was written by the party-of-the-first-part for the party-of-the-second-part. (This is not just true of the Elephantine contracts but also in B1.1, a document of 515 BC from Korobis.) In B4.3//B4.4 there are two parties-of-the-first-part and one party-of-the-second-part; one of the former writes the document at the instruction of the other, and then both are said to have written it for the latter. This is an exceptional case of a party to a contract also acting as writer. (B4.2 may be another – this depends on restoration of text – and here the writer is said to write at the instruction of the witnesses.) In several cases the actual writer works *lpm* of more than one person (B2.9,11, B3.12, B6.4) because there are two parties-of-the-first-part. In B3.8 he is said unusually to work *lpm* the party-of-the-first-part *and* the party-of-the-second-part. All cases with *lpm* + more than one person indicate that *lpm* need not literally refer to verbal dictation. Porten-Yardeni render "at the instruction of", which seems right. The endorsement statements effectively mean "the document which PN1 caused to be written for PN2".

<sup>317</sup> That is, the director or vice-director of the Persepolis economic system, Parnakka, Ziššawiš, Irdumartiya and Ašbazana – assuming that last two were respectively Parnakka's predecessor and successor.

<sup>318</sup> Textually (and sometimes also by seal) Many Category H texts. Also PFNN 086, PFNN 1727 (category C6), PF 0317 (category D), PFNN 0561 (category K1), PFNN 0789 (category L2), PFNN 0152, PFNN 0835, PFNN 1689, PFNN1740 (category P). By seal only: PF 0268, PF 2025, PFNN 0768, PFNN 1186, PFNN 1759 (C4), PF 0247, PF 0254, PFNN 0769 (category C2), PFNN 0719, PFNN 2061 (category C6), PF 0614, PFNN 0685 (category G), PF 1182 (category M).

satrap writes a letter (Arshama to Artavanta, on whose status see A6.3:1 n.); and their appearance does not seem to be limited to “official” contexts (since it occurs in letters from Arshama to his estate-*pqyd* on what are plainly – if the distinction can be made at all – private estate issues).

Even if subscripts do as a matter of fact enshrine some information about the production of non-OP text, that cannot be what necessitates their presence in the text of a particular letter, since the production of non-OP text is common to all the documentary output of Achaemenid bureaucratic systems.<sup>319</sup> The actual formulation and inscribing of Arshama’s Aramaic letters must have been done by exactly the same (sort of) people whether or not there is a subscript: for we surely do not imagine that Arshama wrote the non-subscripted letters himself, or that Varuvahya or Virafsha personally wrote letters sent in their names. (The fact that Artahaya, being a “scribe”, might have been able to write A6.16 is accidental.)

Could their presence be dependent on a plurality of languages *other* than OP being involved? That could as a matter of fact be the case in Persepolis and with the letter of Pherendates (once we accept the postulate that Persepolis subscripts reflect multilingualism in the first place) . It could also apply to Arshama’s subscripted correspondence, at least where the presence of Demotic annotation can be taken as an indirect sign of parallel Demotic scribal activity at the point of origin – which is possible in the case of A6.2 but a good deal more debatable in the case of the relevant Bodleian letters (cf. A6.11:8 n.). But will it work in Bactria? What other language would we think the correspondence of Akhvamazda might have been written in? There is talk of Elamite tablets being found in Afghanistan, but it would be unreasonable to imagine satrapal letters were being written in Elamite in Bactria in the last generation of the empire. In any case, the proper equivalent to the situation in Egypt or Persepolis would be the writing of correspondence in a local Bactrian language. But what would that be? And (more importantly) would it be remotely justified to postulate that there was a writing system for it?

Does the annotation – or the substantive process it represents – in some sense mark the document as comparatively “official” and gives it an allure of formality (even threatening formality?) that is inappropriate when Arshama addresses a high placed functionary such as Artavanta – or more accurately a functionary for whom rhetorical *politesse* is (for whatever reason) also appropriate? Is the inclusion of the subscript perhaps as much a rhetorical as a procedural fact?

Do they after all convey *information* the recipient needs to know? Surely not in most imaginable circumstances. What the recipient needs to know is the content of the message and the fact that it comes from (and with the authority of) Parnakka or Arshama or whoever. One would be on stronger ground saying that the subscripts preserve information which the sender might want to have access to, so that in the event of subsequent developments it was possible to reconstruct who exactly in the secretariat had processed the great man’s instruction. But it is hard to see why that should be substantively less important just because the letter is going to Artavanta (or indeed because it is a Queen, not a quasi-satrap, who is issuing the instruction). This rather reinforces a feeling that, in epistolary contexts, the placing of the subscript in the letter is a rhetorical choice related to the interaction of letter and recipient

And yet. One might still ask why it is a rhetorical choice that a Queen would not make. And one must not forget the presence of subscripts in non-epistolary documents. Is it meaningful to speak of the rhetoric of a Persepolitan Category C4 animal-*baziš* document – at

---

<sup>319</sup> The very fact that the terminology of the subscripts says nothing explicit about translation already points this way.

least if by “rhetoric” one means something designed to manipulate the reactions of the document’s consumers in some particular direction?

## APPENDIX 2: THE FALL AND RISE OF THE ELEPHANTINE TEMPLE

### Events

The starting point lies in an Aramaic letter written by the victims of attack.

In the month of Tammuz, year 14 of Darius the king, when Arshama had departed and gone to the king, the priests of Khnum the God who are in Elephantine the fortress, in collusion with Vidranga who was *frataraka* here, said: “The Temple of YHW the God which is in Elephantine the fortress let them remove from there”. Afterwards that Vidranga, the wicked one, sent a letter to Nafaina his son, who was *rab hayla* in Syene the fortress, saying: “The Temple which is in Elephantine the fortress let them demolish”. Afterwards, Nafaina led the Egyptians with the other troops. They came to the fortress of Elephantine with their implements, broke into that temple, demolished it to the ground, and the pillars of stone which were there – they smashed them. Moreover, it happened that they five gateways of stone, built of hewn stone, which were in that Temple, they demolished. And their standing doors, and the pivots of those doors, (of) bronze, and the roof of cedar-wood – all of these (which, with the rest of the fittings and other things, were there) they burned with fire. But the basins of gold and silver and the other things that were in that Temple – all of these they took and made their own. (tr. Porten-Yardeni)<sup>320</sup>

What is affirmed in this document from the archive of the Jewish priest Jedaniah is clear. An alliance between Persian officials and Egyptian priests led to the complete destruction of a temple of YHW. That the temple was rebuilt emerges from its curt appearance in the boundary definition of a property transfer document dated 13 December 402 (B3.12:17-20). Some have wondered if reconstruction ever really happened. This document is perhaps consistent with reconstruction still being in progress, but, given the emotional nature of the episode, it is inconceivable that it would read as it does if the rebuild had been definitively stalled; and anyway archaeologists now claim to have found the southern enclosure wall of the new temple. As we shall see, reconstruction *could* have started as early as 406 and there is no reason to believe it was not complete before December 402. In the longer run the story ended badly. By the 350s the site was buried under the extended temple precinct of the god Khnum, but well before that the Jews had gone and their temple housed the animals whose dung was recovered by modern archaeology.

Let us identify dates, sites and parties more exactly. The year was the 14<sup>th</sup> of King Darius II, i.e. 410 BC. The month was Tammuz -- ominous for Jews as that in which Nebuchadnezzar captured Jerusalem. Normally Tammuz would have started in June; but there was an intercalary thirteenth month in 411, so this Tammuz did not start until 14 July. Naphaina the *rab hayla* is commander of the Elephantine-Syene garrison; his father Vidranga had held that role but was now *frataraka*, i.e. governor of Southland, the province stretching north from Elephantine towards Thebes. These are the top Persian officials of the region, answerable to the satrap in Memphis. The Jewish Temple was an elongated building in a walled enclosure adjacent to a residential district in central Elephantine.<sup>321</sup> Immediately to its south-east lay the northern enclosure wall of a precinct belonging to the temple of Khnum, the principal deity of Elephantine. There is more to say about the precise amount of space between the two (see below, pp.142-143), but in any event, since it was the priests of Khnum who instigated destruction of the Jewish Temple, we are dealing with a literal as well as metaphorical clash between neighbours. The priests of Khnum of 410 were the latest in a line

---

<sup>320</sup> A4.7:4-13 (25 November 407). Note that A4.7 exists in a second draft (A4.8), differing in many minor details (Porten 1998). I normally cite just A4.7 in what follows.

<sup>321</sup> It is already mentioned in D7.18 (500/475) and A3.3:1 (475-450) and in a boundary definition in 446 (B2.7:13).

that went back far into history, but (under rules established by Darius I<sup>322</sup>) the senior ones owed their positions to positive vetting by the Persian authorities. The Jews were another comparative novelty. Their presence is documentarily proved from at least 495 (B5.1), but their temple allegedly pre-dated Cambyses' conquest in 526 (A4.7:13-14), and most scholars have them arrive in the early sixth or mid- to late seventh century.<sup>323</sup> In the fifth century they are a community whose men are soldiers, part of a garrison that also included Aramaeans, Iranians, Babylonians and Caspians; and it is normally assumed that soldiers is what they had been since they arrived. In a couple of documents of religious content the community is labelled as "the Jewish *hyl*", suggesting a rather strong identification of ethno-cultural and official status.<sup>324</sup> One problem here is the nature of that ethno-cultural status. The term "Jews" begs questions because it may appear to make assumptions about canonical Judaism and the relationship between YHW-worshippers in Elephantine and YHWH-worshippers in Jerusalem or Samaria, when both that relationship and the fifth century existence of canonical Judaism are things that are at issue. One could more properly call them Elephantine Yahwists or Yehudites, but "Jews" remains acceptable so long as one is aware of its limited implications.

In the long run we need to explain why the temple was destroyed, why it was rebuilt and what the episode says about the political/religious environment of the Empire. A first move is to describe other events from before and after the destruction that bear on (our understanding of) the behaviour of one or other party. There are ten items in this category.

(1) In 419 one Hananiah wrote to Jedaniah and the Jewish *hayla* (i) reporting that a message had come from Darius to the satrap Arshama and (ii) giving instructions about Passover and (especially) the Feast of Unleavened Bread.<sup>325</sup> One assumes the giving of instructions reflects royal authorization, though the link is lost in a half-line gap in the papyrus. If so, we have official Persian engagement with Jewish religious practice in Elephantine. Nothing is said about why this arose.

(2) There are indications of troubled times in the shape of an allusion to rebellious Egyptian troops in A4.5 (which recalls talk of rebellion or disturbance in the broadly contemporary Bodleian archive of Arshama letters: A6.7, A6.10, A6.11)<sup>326</sup> and three letters (A4.2-A4.4) which speak of Jews being arrested at Abydos (by Vidranga) and at Thebes and houses being broken into at Elephantine, and complain about Egyptian bribery of Persian officials. A fourth letter mentions the imprisonment of Egyptians (A4.6). No overall narrative can be extracted, and dates are speculative. Arshama is mentioned once, but his role and attitude cannot be clearly discerned.

(3) As of July-August 410 Arshama was not in Egypt, as he had gone to the King (A4.5:2-3, A4.7:4-5). Perhaps it is implied he had only recently gone. There is no evidence of him back in Egypt until 407-406. Why he went we do not know (see Introduction pp.43-44). The Jews are only interested in his absence and alleged ignorance of the July-August 410 episode. It is not even certain they see his departure as an enabling trigger for the *émeute*.

(4) Immediately after the temple's destruction Jedaniah and others wrote to \*Bagavahya, governor of Judah, Jehonanan the Jerusalem High Priest and other priests, and \*Vištana, brother of Anani, and the nobles of the Jews (A4.7:18-19). \*Vištana is a Jew with a

<sup>322</sup> P.Berlin 13540 [Porten 2011, C2]: 4-5 (21 April 492).

<sup>323</sup> See e.g. Porten 1968, 8-16, 105-122, Becking 2003, Kahn 2007.

<sup>324</sup> A4.4:1, C.3.15:1. It is not certain that an ostrakon (CG X11c) listing Jews who received the "share" (*prs*) is a sufficiently official document to demonstrate anything about the official status of the description "Jewish".

<sup>325</sup> A4.1. Most of the document is about the latter. There is no likelihood that the complete gaps in the first half of lines 3 and 9 contained anything to undermine this proposition

<sup>326</sup> See Introduction, pp.39-44.

Persian name, but this need not be true of \*Bagavahya, and the chances are quite strong that he was a Persian.<sup>327</sup> We do not have this letter or know its precise contents. But we *do* know it received no answer.

(5) We do, however, have a (damaged) letter (A4.5) from 410 intended for an unknown recipient (presumably in Egypt). The papyrus is formally eccentric, having two columns on the *recto* and single column (oriented at right angles) on the *verso*, and there are four three-line gaps on the *recto* and half the *verso* is missing. The preserved *recto* refers to: Egyptian rebellion and Jewish loyalty; Arshama's departure; the Khnum priests giving Vidranga silver and goods and acting in collusion with him; their demolition of part of the royal barley house and the building of a wall in the middle of fortress Elephantine; and their blocking of a well used by the garrison. The addressee is invited to check the truth of all of this with judges, "police" and "hearers" of the Southland. On the battered *verso* words or phrases such as "meal-offering", YHW, "brazier", "the 'fittings' they took and made their own" and "demolished" are visible, and three successive sentences begin "if it please our Lord". It is tempting to detect an allusion to the temple's destruction and certain that the addressee's help is requested. Since there is no verbal continuity between *recto* and *verso* and since they are in a formally peculiar relationship, there is some question about their articulation: it might even be that the two sides are preliminary drafts for *different* documents. In any case, it is odd that the invitation to seek confirmation from local officials precedes any visible reference to the temple. Is this because the events on the *recto* are new ones, prompting report and complaint, whereas the temple affray (on the *verso*) is something already reported and validated?<sup>328</sup> Or should we imagine that the *recto* once spoke of the temple-destruction in the six lines missing between its two columns? On that view (and assuming that an apparently full narrative of all outrages was chronological) the blocking of the well followed the temple-destruction, but the demolition of the barley house and building of a wall preceded it. Or are we deceived in detecting the temple's destruction in the *verso* text? Has it not yet happened, even if something *has* happened that makes the writer speak of YHW and meal-offerings? What is at stake is our precise reconstruction of events in July-August 410. Demolishing a temple is one thing; demolishing a royal storehouse, building a wall and blocking a well is another. They are unlikely to be unconnected. But what order they came in is not an empty question.

(6) Wherever A4.5 belongs in that summer, the temple-destruction must have prompted not just the letter to \*Bagavahya and the rest, but also a complaint to authorities closer to home. I stress this lest the Jews' later statement (A4.7:30) that Arshama knew nothing of what happened suggest otherwise. Arshama was outside Egypt but, if he really knew nothing, it must be because officials in Egypt (but outside Elephantine) told him nothing, not because those officials had been told nothing. The impression created by other Arshama documentation (and by the letters of the Bactrian satrap Akhvamazda<sup>329</sup>) is that the world of satraps was prone to micromanagement and obsessed with information flow, so I find it hard to believe no one told Arshama anything at any stage.

(7) For the Jews temple-demolition led to an era in which they made no sacrifices, wore sackcloth, fasted, and abstained from oil, wine and sexual intercourse (A4.7:15,19-22).

---

<sup>327</sup> This turns essentially on one's attitude to Joseph.AJ 11.298-346. I follow the view that it is a chronologically displaced narrative of events that belong in the fifth century.

<sup>328</sup> Believing this (which is what is implicit in von Pilgrim 2003, 307 n.11) is dependent on believing that "in year 14 when Arshama went to the king, this is the evil that the priests did" could be used to introduce anything but the great outrage (as in A4.7) or (as on the second view) a narrative that would in due course encompass the great outrage at its right moment amidst all the others. And this is a bit difficult.

<sup>329</sup> Naveh & Shaked 2012

That is straightforward. They also prayed to YHW, and this is less straightforward, not in itself but for what comes next (A4.7:15-17). In Porten-Yardeni (which reflects the traditional view) what comes next is that dogs take the fetters from Vidranga's feet (understood as a reference to honorific jewellery, despite the complete lack of evidence for Achaemenids wearing ankle bracelets), he loses all the goods he had acquired, all those whose sought evil for the Temple are killed, and YHW lets the Jews gloat over both them and Vidranga. In other words, something bad has happened to the Jews' adversaries.

Is this true? In favour are two things: Vidranga is called "wicked" in the otherwise sober narrative of temple demolition (A4.7:7), which was perhaps not wise if officially his reputation remained unimpaired; and his status as *frataraka* (and his son's as *rab hayla*) are in the past tense ("Vidranga who *was* the *frataraka* here").<sup>330</sup> Against are considerations of grammar and rhetorical structure.

As to grammar, some feel that to consign YHW's avenging action to a dependent relative clause is odd and that it is better to see the words as the content (not the outcome) of a prayer to YHW. Hence the translation proposed by Lindenberger:

... and (we) prayed to YHW the lord of heaven: "Show us our revenge on that Vidranga: may the dogs tear his guts out from between his legs! May all the property he got perish! May all the men who plotted evil against that temple – all of them – be killed! And may we watch them!"<sup>331</sup>

Its viability depends on the verbs: *prima facie* they are perfects, i.e. expressive of completed action, so the alternative view entails the precative use of the past tense – essentially that one seeks to ensure the success of a prayer by phrasing the aspiration as though it had already happened. There are no examples in imperial Aramaic, but the usage has been claimed in Hebrew (and Syriac), not least in cases where, as here, some of the verbs *could* morphologically be imperatives.

For the amateur Aramaist, assessment of such a matter is hard. Rhetorical structure is easier, and the alternative translation has merits here. If lines 15-18 are merely an aspiration then \*Bagavahya is asked to intervene in a situation of unrelieved gloom (destruction of a temple that survived Cambyses, sackcloth, abstinence, as-yet-unanswered prayer) and it is the unrelieved quality of that gloom that is to touch his heart – a simple rhetorical posture. On the traditional reading a tactical *victory* is slipped into the middle of the gloom. That victory has not caused restoration of the temple but one *would* expect it to be deployed as a reason for \*Bagavahya to help: destruction of the temple, suspension of sacrifices and abstinence are hard, but Vidranga and his associates have suffered and this is an encouragement to believe that with \*Bagavahya's help restoration of the *status quo ante* can be secured. In other words, what happened to Vidranga and his associates ought to come just before the direct appeal to \*Bagavahya.

But there are answers to this. One is that Vidranga and his associates were not victims of official punishment (as I have been tacitly assuming) but of violent counter-attack by the Jews.<sup>332</sup> That might account for some evasiveness (and attribution of credit to YHW) and would not have advanced the cause of temple-restoration. But it is a very extreme scenario. A better answer is to read the rhetoric differently. Straight after the initial bad event we actually have *two* good signs -- (a) the temple's survival in 526 (a positive thing in itself, not just a foil to the negativity of the eventual destruction) and (b) the sufferings of Vidranga and his associates – before the gloom sets in, starting with the *lack* of response to the first letter to

---

<sup>330</sup> For interplay of *zy* + perfect and *zy* + unspoken present (as in A4.7:4-6) cf. A6.4: who was *pqyd* in my estates which (are) in Upper and Lower Egypt.

<sup>331</sup> Lindenberger 2003, 75. (The disagreement about what the dogs did/should do is of secondary importance here.) For the argument in favour of this rendering see Lindenberger 2001.

<sup>332</sup> This was the view of von Hoonacker 1915, 45.

Jerusalem, to which the appeal for a response now corresponds at the climax of the letter. This is perhaps a less obvious rhetorical approach, but feasible.

In deciding what happened, then, we are pitting grammar against the other hints that Vidranga's (and Nafaina's) status had changed, and specifically against Vidranga's designation as "wicked", since the putative fact that he and Nafaina were no longer *frataraka* and *rab hayla* might in theory have a non-drastring explanation. The refusal of local officials to permit reconstruction (cf. "they do not let us rebuild it" in A4.7:27) proves nothing, of course, since punishment of perpetrators does not guarantee restitution to victims -- and it is anyway conceivable that, despite the Jews' perspective, they were primarily punished for some other malfeasance. I do remain tempted by Lindenberger's approach; and, if one is swayed the other way by Vidranga's advertised "wickedness", there is another problem to be confronted. The Jews claim Arshama knew nothing of what was done to them (A4.7:30). We now have to believe not only that claim but also that Arshama knew nothing of the punishment of a provincial governor, a strategic garrison commander and others. The Bodleian archive shows he kept an eye on his personal estate when outside Egypt. Did he entirely remit state business to a deputy? We do not know enough of the *mores* of absentee satraps to infer that Vidranga and the rest remained unscathed. But it is an additional loose end in the traditional view.

(8) The Jews' first letter to Jerusalem produced no response. In November 407 they tried again (A4.7//A4.8) – but with a difference. In 410 they appealed to the Persian governor \*Bagavahya, the Second Temple priests and the secular nobles. Now they appealed just to \*Bagavahya and (in parallel) to Delaiah and Shelemaiah, the sons of Sanballat, \*Bagavahya's counterpart in Samaria. The letter exists in two drafts, the second differing in 48 details of vocabulary, phrasing or orthography (Porten 1998), but both saying substantively the same (and both dated 25 November). After a gushing greeting (cf. A6.3:1 n.), its burden is the temple's destruction, the sad situation of the Jews (sackcloth, teetotalism, celibacy), the request that \*Bagavahya support rebuilding of the temple and a promise that, should he do so, meal-offerings, incense and holocausts will be offered in his name, there will be constant prayers for him, and he will have more merit before YHW than one who offers holocausts and sacrifices worth 1000 talents – a sum the Athenian Empire would have struggled to raise in tribute at this time. This extravagant conclusion is followed by two important notes: a similar letter has gone to Delaiah and Shelemaiah; and Arshama knew nothing of what had happened to the Jews. By contrast with A4.5, this letter concentrates on the temple and ignores storehouse, wall and well. This does not prove those issues have been settled but merely that the authority of \*Bagavahya and the Samaritans would most usefully be deployed on what was for the Jews the most important issue.

(9) The result appears in A4.9, a 56 word memorandum of the reply from \*Bagavahya and Delaiah that the writer is to report to Arshama in Egypt. The contrast with the elaborate and obsessively redrafted rhetoric of the appeal is stark, though in alluding to the temple's antiquity and describing Vidranga as "wicked" it repeats bits of that rhetoric. The content is a recommendation that the temple be restored to its previous state and that meal-offering and incense be offered on the altar as formerly. Two things leap out. First, this is a recommendation to Arshama in Egypt.<sup>333</sup> So Arshama will be in Egypt when the messenger gets there. One wonders whether his actual or expected return prompted the renewed appeal to Jerusalem and Samaria. The note about his ignorance of the case (A4.7:30) functions as an implied assurance to \*Bagavahya and Delaiah that he has no view from which they might be in danger of dissenting. The point would be more salient if everyone knew Arshama was

---

<sup>333</sup> The complex palaeography of the opening lines (cf. Porten 1979, 96-100) does not suggest any doubt about this at any stage.

going to be in a position to intervene personally. (By the same token the claim needed to seem plausible, which puts extra pressure on the conundrum about Vidranga's punishment, especially if that were supposed to be recent.) The second thing that stands out is that \*Bagavahya and Delaiah do not give the Jews what they want. The *status quo ante* involved meal-offerings, incense and holocausts. The recommendation only authorizes meal-offerings and incense.

(10) That this is not an inadvertence is guaranteed by a final document (A4.10) – another formally odd one. A list of five names, summarized as “5 persons in all, Syenians who are *mhhsn* in Elephantine the fortress”<sup>334</sup> is followed by a statement to an unnamed “lord”. After mentioning the rebuilding of the temple, the absence of burnt-offerings of sheep, cattle and goats, and the presence of meal- and incense-offerings, this offers silver and 1000 ardabs of barley to “the house of our lord”, if he makes a formal pronouncement (the term is Iranian: \**avadaisa*<sup>335</sup>). This is far removed from the epistolary rhetoric of the appeal to \*Bagavahya and Delaiah, and the designation of the Jews as Syenians and hereditary property holders evokes the language of formal contracts. Jewish garrison-members were based in Elephantine, non-Jewish ones in Syene, but the overall commander is associated with Syene, and they were probably technically all part of the “Syene garrison”. Jews who call themselves Syenians (especially using a quasi-Iranian linguistic form<sup>336</sup>) are accommodating technical niceties to ensure they make a good impression. In any case, what we have is a blunt offer: you do so-and-so, we give your estate a substantial payment. (1000 *ardabas* is a month's rations for 540 men at the rate encountered in C3.14, and for 1000 men at basic Persepolitan rates.) All the unnamed lord (presumably Arshama) has to do is sign off the agreement to rebuild. And what he gets for doing so looks uncommonly like a bribe. The document does not prove the deal was accepted, but, in the absence of contrary indications, we naturally suppose that it was.

To summarize: In the background we have Egyptian “rebellion”, Persian authorization for Jewish religious celebrations, signs of trouble between Jews and Egyptians (also involving Persian authorities). In July/August 410 the temple was destroyed and other architectural interventions occurred. Appeals to secular and religious authorities in Jerusalem and to Persian officials in Egypt produced no result. That Vidranga and co-conspirators suffered for what they done before November 407 – whether officially or otherwise – is possible but not entirely certain. Nearly three-and-a-half years after the attack, an appeal to secular authorities in Palestine, coinciding with Arshama's return to Egypt, produced a better, but not perfect, result, and only at some expense. From some date in 406 the Jews were free to start rebuilding, and the job was done before late 402. Such are the apparent facts. How do we explain them?

### Explanations

In 410 we are a decade from a reassertion of Egyptian autonomy that would last until 343; and rebellion by Egyptian soldiers lies in the background (A4.5:1). Action by Egyptian priests against servants of the Persian state *might* have a nationalist or revolutionary overtone. But they can hardly have presented it thus to Vidranga and Naphaina, and we cannot start by assuming Persian officials took a bribe explicitly to damage their own state-interests. One would actually be on stronger ground suggesting that those officials were seeking to *mitigate* Egyptian hostility to Persian occupation by co-operating with the priests.

---

<sup>334</sup> On this term see A6.11:2 n.

<sup>335</sup> Tavernier 2007, 447.

<sup>336</sup> The ending of *Swnknn* makes it an Iranian gentile form. See Ciancaglini 2012, 95.

One recent approach (promoted by Pierre Briant and Cornelius von Pilgrim) seeks an explanation in topography and property law.

Current archaeological evidence indicates that the enclosure walls of the Jewish and Khnum temple precincts (M500 and M329) ran parallel with virtually no intervening gap.<sup>337</sup> It also indicates that, after the Jewish temple was destroyed, a new wall (M495) was built parallel to the Khnum precinct wall but slightly further north; and, when the Jewish temple was reconstructed, its new enclosure wall followed roughly *that* wall's line rather than the original one. Meanwhile, it will be recalled, the Khnum priests were accused of demolishing part of a royal storehouse, building a wall in the middle of Elephantine and blocking a well (A4.5:508). We know the storehouse was close to the temple, separated by just a single block of houses. In 420 it abutted this block (B3.7:7). But in 404 and 402 a "covered wall" *alias* "way of the god" lay between them (B3.10:8, B3.11:3-4) and, since there was a small shrine on the north side of the houses (first attested 404: B3.10:9), the "covered wall"/"way of the god" was perhaps an access to that shrine along the eastern edge of the houses. It is therefore claimed that creation of this "covered wall"/"way of the god" is what caused partial demolition of the storehouse. It is also claimed that it is part of the "wall in the middle of fortress Elephantine" and that another part is wall M495. Because the term "covered wall" *might* also be rendered "defence wall",<sup>338</sup> it is further suggested that the wall was meant to block off the temple site and the houses to its east and north, "protecting" other parts of Elephantine from the Jewish community living in those houses. To put it emotively, the Egyptian priests stand accused of creating a walled ghetto. If we had the missing 6 lines in the middle of A4.5 we *might* find the Jews making a similar accusation, though the fact that the papyrus *recto* breaks off with the words "Moreover, we are separated..." hardly guarantees it.

But there are problems. First, the sole known well on Elephantine lay to the east, outside the putative walled area. So why block it, if the Jews could not get at it anyway? Second, no evidence is claimed of a "defence wall" north of the shrine to hem the residential quarter in from that direction. And third, historically (if not demonstrably in 410) non-Jews lived in the relevant residential quarter. *Prima facie* the putative wall would have ghettoized all sorts of garrison members, not just Jewish ones – and indeed people who were not garrison members at all. So I think we should put a question mark against this aspect of the archaeological-historical reconstruction. (This is where it is particularly vexing that the current state of A4.5 means we cannot be sure of the chronological relation between wall-building and temple destruction. The archaeologists' reading requires the wall to come second, whereas *prima facie* it was the other way round.)

We also know nothing of the shrine's character. It is sometimes claimed that Jewish objections to its (planned) creation ignited the whole dispute:<sup>339</sup> but it might already have existed before 410 and, if it did not, the plan to create it next to a Jewish house and/or putative Jewish objections may be a symptom of existing tensions not the cause of new ones. Further comment is difficult.

What can attract comment are the near-abutting enclosure walls of the two temples. The claim has been made (by von Pilgrim) that the southern side of the Jewish Temple had encroached upon a historic main route across Elephantine, and that the temple's removal was justified by application of a law attested only in a Hellenistic document but perhaps originating in a codification of Pharaonic law ordered by Darius I.<sup>340</sup> This law dealt with

<sup>337</sup> See von Pilgrim op.cit. (n.7), with his figs. 1-2.

<sup>338</sup> The crucial word *hmpn'* is an Iranian loanword, *\*hanpana-* (Tavernier 2007, 439) or *\*ha(m)-nipana* (Shaked ap. Porten 2011, 237 n.18).

<sup>339</sup> This is one feature of an influential treatment of the whole episode in Briant 1996a.

<sup>340</sup> This is another feature of the treatment in Briant 1996a.

buildings erected on someone else's land. Since the term King's Road is used of streets round the Jewish Temple and since the temple encroaches on the line of the historic cross-island route its presence might be regarded as breaking the law against building on another person's land (the other person being the King). If so, its destruction was legally justified, and the event of July-August 410 simply executed a legal judgment.<sup>341</sup> Perhaps that this is formally true. But: the temple had been there since before 526 BC, so if it encumbered a "historic" royal road it had done so for over twelve decades; and, when the temple was demolished a new wall was built (M490), which left a gap of 2 metres north of the Khnum precinct, but *did not restore the putative historic highway*. From these facts I infer that any reference to royal highways and/or property law was window-dressing and can tell us little or nothing about real motives.

The clearest salient statement about hostility (as opposed to report of specific hostile action) is the remark in a pre-410 letter that "Khnum has been hostile to us since Hananiah was in Egypt" (A4.3:7). This is a religious proposition – one about the god not just about Egyptians. The Hananiah in question was inescapably the homonymous author of the letter about Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread (A4.1) – i.e. a religious document. Why might *that* have caused problems with Khnum?

Although the Feast of Unleavened Bread is not previously attested, Passover was not new to Elephantine, and, other things being equal, any Egyptian objections to the story's anti-Egyptian character ought by 410 to have been mitigated by habituation.<sup>342</sup> The eventual restoration of the Jewish temple was accompanied by a ban on animal burnt offerings, and one possibility is that this reflects the Khnum priests' objection to the sacrifice of sheep and rams, Khnum being a ram-headed god.<sup>343</sup> (Oddly enough, the *Exodus* narrative actually includes the idea that Jewish sacrifices offended Egyptians: 8:23-24.<sup>344</sup>) Passover celebrations might not

---

<sup>341</sup> Pestman 1985, 118-129, providing parallel texts of Hermopolis Code VI 3-11 (Mattha) and P.Oxy.3285 fr.1:13-23, which is the evidence for discussion of what happens when someone builds on another's land. Both documents indicate that, if the builder loses the case, he may remove the construction materials himself (Hermopolis VI 10-11; P.Oxy.3285 fr.1: 14-17,22-23). If there had been a legal process, the Jews (as losers) did not exercise such a right. But we could not infer from their necessarily partial account that they had not been offered it and, presumably, in the event of the defeated party taking no action the victorious party must in due course have been permitted to take direct action. The involvement of the Persian authorities in that direct action could doubtless reflect the fact that the king's property rights were theoretically at stake.

<sup>342</sup> Joseph. *Ap.*1.73ff,227ff is cited by Porten 1968, 281 as evidence for negative Egyptian reactions during the Hellenistic era to the Jewish account of Exodus. The pertinence of this material (which is informed by Manetho on the Hyksos: fr. 9 & 12 V-W = FGrH 680 FF 8 & 10a) to fifth century conditions cannot perhaps be taken for granted.

<sup>343</sup> Hdt.2.42,46 represents the sacrifice of sheep or goats as a matter that divided Egyptians, so that (e.g.) devotees of Theban Zeus and inhabitants of the Theban nome in general sacrifice goats but not sheep, while those with a sanctuary of Mendes or who come from the Mendesian nome sacrifice sheep but not goats – a phenomenon he connects with the theriomorphic representations of the salient deities (though his treatment is perhaps not in all respects Egyptologically robust).

<sup>344</sup> Wajdenbaum 2012 even suggests that this reflects events at Elephantine, *Exodus* being a book whose final recension is of fourth century date. The strange blending of the Jews and the Hyksos that appears in Manetho fr.12 V-W = FGrH 609 F10a involves the "unclean" inhabitants of Avaris led by Osarsephos (*alias* Moses) making a point of sacrificing all of the animals considered sacred by Egyptians (as well as killing them in other contexts). Outside a Jewish context, Ian Rutherford draws my attention also to P.Giessen 99, which contains a complaint that, in a cult of Apollo at Hermoupolis, hymns were sung in a foreign tongue and sacrifices of sheep and goats performed in a fashion "most opposite to that of native Egyptian rituals". (The papyrus is said to be of II-III c. AD date, but at one point cites two *stelae* set up in front of the temple that dated from 80-79 BC.)

have affected this (if, as is possible, they did not take place on the temple), but the Feast of Unleavened Bread presupposed temple sacrifices involving rams and lambs<sup>345</sup> – as indeed did the general calendar of sacrifices in Numbers 28. So, if Biblical texts are a valid guide, and if ram-sacrifice is a potential problem, then the Passover letter is not the limit of the problem. Yet Hananiah's arrival is a watershed for bad relations between Khnum and Jews. So perhaps his mission had a wider remit than the Passover letter and caused offence either for reasons wholly unrelated to ram-sacrifices or because it tended positively to promote ram-sacrifices. There were certainly holocausts before 410, and A4.9:10 ("there shall be no sacrifice of sheep, ox or goat") implies they included sheep (as biblical indications would suggest), so the first option is only available if there is something else Hananiah might have done to upset Khnum and if we believe that Khnum priests did not care about other people sacrificing rams. Kottsieper 2002b has sought that "something else" by identifying Hananiah as a Persian official regulating the affairs of the Jewish community and arguing that this implied the (first) official recognition of that community as a religious group. Such recognition offended Khnum – not for any particular content (Kottsieper leaves unclear what official recognition as a religious group means) but because they resented a foreign minority being given special status. It will be clear that such an open-ended reading is not inconsistent with my second option, viz. that – whatever else happened -- Hananiah did something to promote ram-sacrifice. That would, of course, raises questions about the *status quo ante* and what Hananiah did/said. Had Jews *avoided* such sacrifices before? Was Hananiah radically changing things, e.g. by urging the adoption of (what we know as) Biblical norms?

I do not know, but I do think we should accept that religious issues underlay the demolition of the temple and that they stemmed from change to the *status quo* associated with the outsider Hananiah. Hananiah's activity is plainly Persian-approved, given that the Passover letter involves royal authorization. Some current views take it that the Jerusalem temple authorities were active or passive partners as well. That would mean that the post-419 situation in Elephantine was in principle acceptable to those authorities. If, on the other hand, Hananiah had nothing to do with Jerusalem but was a Babylonian Jew associated with the royal court (like Nehemiah) undertaking a religious mission to the Jews of Egypt, no such inference would follow. Either way in 410 the Elephantine Jews might believe (whether on positive evidence or the absence of negative evidence) that the Jerusalem authorities would be sympathetic and they are therefore included (along with secular notables) in the first appeal. The non-Jewish governor \*Bagavahya is included because his *imprimatur* would carry weight with officials in Egypt.

In the event there was no response. The letter may have arrived at a bad time. From Josephus 11.298-346 we learn that the High Priest Jehohanan was in dispute with \*Bagavahya, who had wished Jehohanan's brother Yeshua to have the office. At some point Jehohanan murdered his brother inside the Temple precinct and as a consequence \*Bagavahya imposed punitive taxation on Temple sacrifices. One view, neither provable nor disprovable, is that the murder and the arrival of the 410 appeal roughly coincided (Albertz 2003), but whatever the chronology co-operative action by \*Bagavahya and Jehohanan was liable to be difficult.

Perhaps it was their belated discovery (through other channels) of this situation that led the Jews to exclude the Jerusalem priests and notables from their second appeal in 407. Instead they appealed to \*Bagavahya again and (in parallel) to his counterpart in Samaria – or to the sons of his counterpart: Sanballat himself was presumably known to be out of action for some reason – a sign that the appellants know more about the situation in Palestine than is explicit in the letter. Why these addressees? And why separately? As to the second question, presumably to obviate the danger of appearing to give precedence to one or the other. And that is part of the answer to the first question. \*Bagavahya's primary claim lay in being Persian: that would still

---

<sup>345</sup> Numb. 28.16-25, Ezek. 45.23-24.

matter in influencing the Persian authorities in Egypt. He was also a governor with direct experience of a Yahwist temple. The Samaritans' primary claim lay in their being Yahwists – though they are also (by proxy) of governor status, and are certainly not priests: the appellants wish to forestall the risk of division between secular and sacred authorities.

To shift the appeal from the Yahwists of Jerusalem to those of Samaria was not a neutral act. One of the things in the background that has not been mentioned so far is that, on current understanding of the archaeological evidence, there was already a Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim and, indeed, it had only relatively recently come into existence (Magen 2007). The men of Elephantine were therefore not just appealing to another group of fellow Yahwists but to one that some might regard as a transgressive group. This is not irrelevant since some might also regard the Elephantine people as a transgressive group.

Assessing possible Palestinian Jewish reactions to the Elephantine appeal is hampered by the difficulty of knowing what counted as canonical to whom in the late fifth century BC. Given the right circumstances there could have been objections to: their having any temple or their having a temple in which holocausts were offered (definitely unacceptable under Deuteronomic centralization) or their deviations from monotheism -- a capitulation list of the Jewish *hayla* benefits the Aramaean deities Eshembethel and Anathbethel as well as YHW (C3.15:123-128); community members not only swear by YHW, but also by Herembethel (B7.2) or Herem and Anathyahu (B7.3:3) or even the Egyptian Sati (B2.8:5), and their epistolary greetings speak of “all the gods” (A3.7, A4.2) or even in one ironic case YHW and Khnum (D7.21). These are, of course, “only” matters of social vocabulary, and some say Eshembethel and Anathbethel are “only” hypostases of YHW (Porten 1968, 173-179), but to those minded to draw barriers such things could matter. So would the fact (if fact it is) that the stone pillars smashed during the temple's demolition were physical representations of the divine.<sup>346</sup> Less concretely, the totality of salient Aramaic documentation from Elephantine (a large number of items, even if many be highly fragmentary ostraca) is consistent with a community that was not heavily religious and was e.g. fairly relaxed about the Sabbath. Meanwhile, some Palestinian spectators might even have wondered whether the curses heaped by Jeremiah upon the Jews of Egypt (42.18, 44.12-14) actually applied to those in Elephantine. In these circumstances, it is (of course) peculiarly vexing that we cannot figure out whether Hananiah came to Elephantine from Palestine and what exactly was the scope of his activities when he got there.

By any reckoning the Elephantine Yahwists were outliers with a history that entirely or partially disconnected them from the experience of Exile and Return so important to the people of Judah. That disconnection was something they shared with Samaritans. It does not necessarily follow that the Samaritans – carving out religious claims of their own within the historical Promised Land – would see it that way.

There are various things to say about the eventual response.

Bagavahya and Delaiah do not reply separately, so there has been consultation, and the decision was surely based on more than the data in A4.7. It might have included the data in the unanswered letter of 410 and recollection of any discussion at that time. But it should also include questioning of the carriers of the 407 letter. Examination of the handwriting shows that the memorandum-of-response was written by one of those involved in writing down A4.7/A4.8.<sup>347</sup> So this person travelled from Elephantine to Palestine. We should not see him as a mere scribe (some think it was Jedaniah himself), and he will not have been alone. Many details

---

<sup>346</sup> This is mooted by Becking 2007.

<sup>347</sup> The writer of A4.9 also wrote A4.7:12-30 and all of A4.8. A4.7/A4.8 are only drafts, so the writer of A4.9 was involved in the planning and composition of the \*Bagavahya/Delaiah/Shelemaiah appeal, and is not simply a fair-copy scribe.

of the events of 410 lost to us were available to Bagavahya and Delaiah; and they would have foolish not to have sought more explanation of the original event.

The response speaks of the Altar House of the God of Heaven. Altar House is an unusual phrase, whose choice suggests the respondents were thinking specifically about sacrificial matters. The substitution of God of Heaven for YHW is consistent with occasional Elephantine Jewish usage (it occurs e.g. in the greeting to Bagavahya in A4.7), but also contributes to a certain neutrality of language. Taken as a whole the phrase avoids both the appellants' Temple of YHW and Samaritans designation of Gerizim as the House of YHWH, and *might* even be an implicit hint that Samaritans did not like the idea of temples outside Palestine.

Above all there is the omission of holocausts. Some say this was caused by Persian hostility to burnt sacrifice. It is true that, while it is clear that Persians sacrificed animals, there is little unequivocal sign of them offering burned sacrifices; and, although Margaret Root has written that Persepolis Fortification seals offer "abundant representational evidence...for altars where fire is burning for the performance of a sacrificial (burnt) offering of an animal" (Root 2010, 174 n.34), in terms of published material this comes down to a couple of items, neither of which actually shows an animal being burned.<sup>348</sup> On the other hand, there is no reason to think Persians generally hostile to others doing it (an early fifth century letter implicitly indicates its acceptability in the Khnum temple<sup>349</sup>), so there would have to be a particular provocation in this case, and the provocation could only have come from the other parties. The fact that the ban extends beyond ovine sacrifice suggests that it is not just the priests of Khnum who matter, though they may have had a negative view and this may have been known to \*Bagavahya and Delaiah. So the crucial hindrance must be from Palestine. The Jerusalem priests are not directly relevant in 407-406. But perhaps Samaria also wanted limits. Whatever the implications of "altar-house", it need not only be Jerusalem that wanted a monopoly (or near-monopoly) on YHWH temples. All the considerations making Elephantine Jews look "odd" could apply in Samaria as well as Jerusalem. And the very novelty of the establishment of their own temple as a typologically distinct counterpart to that in Jerusalem might actually underline a tendency to exclusivism. Countenancing a *non*-holocaust sanctuary in the Upper Nile would be a suitable compromise – specially sweet if they had reason to suppose the Jerusalem priests would not have countenanced it at all.

This joint Persian-Samaritan recommendation was eventually accepted by Arshama. There were pragmatic reasons: it would make their Jewish soldiers happier and perhaps restore revenue (temples can be tax generating entities, though there is no evidence about that aspect of the Jewish one in Elephantine). But I suggest there was also a default acceptance that a well-defined community with a long history was entitled to have an appropriate place of worship – especially when that place itself had a long history. (The recurrence of Cambyses in the memorandum reflects stress on that in the full \*Bagavahya/Delaiah judgment.) \*Bagavahya's support deserves special note. A Persian official who had had considerable trouble with the Yahwist temple in his own backyard might have been expected to be prejudiced against such places. Of course, the whole process took time. *Prima facie* reaction on the issue was effectively stalled until Arshama returned to Egypt (and *perhaps* until the disappearance of Vidranga and Nafaina). And, even then, there was a delay before Arshama gave full authorization. Perhaps the King needed to be consulted (the same possibility arises *à propos* of the Gerizim temple) but in any event the Jews felt palm-greasing was called for. But bribes may be needed even if they do not change what happens (this episode and the strange formalism of A4.10 are in fact interesting sidelights on Achaemenid back-hander culture, about which we generally see far less than one might expect) and, all things considered, this is a story with an element of affirmative religious

---

<sup>348</sup> PFS 0075: Garrison 2008, 219 fig. 8. PFS 0111: *ibid.* 234 fig.48.

<sup>349</sup> P.Berlin 13539 [Porten 2011, C1]: 3-4 (25 December 493)

tolerance. The fact that there is also an element of compromise does not alter that – indeed, in a sense, it enhances the point.

### The wider perspective

The Jews had reason to expect something of the sort. The construction of Palestinian Jewish history in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah pictures Persia as benign and, though those books were finalized later, they need not enshrine a view very different from the contemporary one. Of course, there could be difficult moments (e.g. \*Bagavahya's problems with Jehohanan or Persian complaisance to the Samaritan temple): but objecting to the murder of a priest in the Jerusalem temple and supporting religious self-expression in Samaria (as well as Jerusalem or Elephantine) do not redound to Persian discredit. Strict Jewish monotheism will have been odd for most Persians, but they could handle it. And there is no evidence of an Egyptian Jewish perception that Persian religion was hostile: the belief that the writer of an Elephantine letter (A4.2:6) once contemptuously labels a troublesome Persian official as a "Mazdaean" is misguided; the man was simply called \*Mazdayasna.

Nor is any of this too surprising in the larger perspective. The Persians were polytheists. This is evident wherever you look. Greeks certainly knew it. Persian royal inscriptions, for all their focus on Ahuramazda, also speak of "other gods" or "all the gods" and, in the fourth century, explicitly of Anahita and Mithra.<sup>350</sup> The world of the Persepolis Fortification archive is full of gods (nineteen can be identified, among whom Ahuramazda does not enjoy a status commensurate with his importance in royal texts; and then there are eleven mountains and five rivers which may also be deemed divine) but, in a bureaucratic environment, there is so little concern about precise identity that very many sacrifice-allocations are made without identification of the divine beneficiary, while others are just for "all the gods".<sup>351</sup> Epistolary greeting formulae speak of the goodwill of plural gods. Personal onomastics encode many divine names - familiar (e.g. Mithra), unfamiliar (e.g. Vata or Naryasanga) and otherwise unrecorded (Tir-, the god of writing) - and yet still entirely miss others (Anahita).<sup>352</sup> Persepolitan seal-stones offer various divine images: the winged disk figure; the bust-in-circle; a goddess in a nimbus<sup>353</sup>; at least two cult-stature types, male and female;<sup>354</sup> and the deities represented by omnipresent moons and stars. Moreover the religious landscape is not just plural but diverse. The gods of the homeland are Indo-Iranian, Elamite and Babylonian in origin, even if they populate a single religious landscape at the end of a long process of Elamite-Iranian acculturation. Glyptic images offer two types of altar (with distinct iconological syntaxes, and presumably religious significance<sup>355</sup>) and cult-statues that are associated with neither, not to mention numerous representations of Babylonian worship (actually much more common than

---

<sup>350</sup> Ahuramazda the greatest of the gods: DPd §1, DPh §2 = DH §2, DSf §3, DSp, XE, XV, A<sup>2</sup>Hc. Ahuramazda and the other gods who are: DB §§62-63 (a high-profile passage). Ahuramazda with all the gods: DPf (Elamite); DPd §3 (14,22,24), DSe §6. Ahuramazda with the gods: DSt §2, XPb §3 = XPd §3 = XV §3 = XSc §2 [= A<sup>1</sup>Pa §4], XPc §3, XPg, D<sup>2</sup>Sa. Ahuramazda associated with Mithra/Anahita: A<sup>2</sup>Hb, A<sup>2</sup>Sa §3, A<sup>2</sup>Sd §2, A<sup>3</sup>Pa §4.

<sup>351</sup> See Henkelman 2008. Attested deities (italicized items are not Iranian): *Humban* (26 texts), *Mišebaka* [= "all the gods"] (12 texts), Ahuramazda (10 texts), *Napiriša* (10 texts), *Adad* (7 texts), *Ispandaramattiš* (6 texts), *Mišdušiš* [= "giving reward"] (6 texts), *Mariras* [= sunrise]: (4 texts); *Turma* (3 texts); *Pirdamakiya* (= "he who fulfils wishes") (3 texts); *AŠKI<sup>MEŠ</sup>* (Earth) (2 texts); *Narišanka*: (2 texts); *Irdanapirutiš* (2 texts); *Minam* (1 text); *Šetrabattiš* (1 text); *Halma* (1 text); *Nahhunte* (1 text); *Nabbazabba* (1 text); *Šimur* (1 text); *Anturza* (1 text).

<sup>352</sup> See Tavernier 2007, 539-543.

<sup>353</sup> PFS 38, PTS 21 (Garrison [forthcoming (b)], figs.47 and 51).

<sup>354</sup> Briant 2002, fig.37a; Ghirshman 1964, fig.563.

<sup>355</sup> Garrison 2001, 52-54.

scenes of Persian worship).<sup>356</sup> Textual evidence offers various types of religious officiant, not just the magi familiar in Greek sources: and the magi of Persepolis (and Babylon) arguably have a distinct profile from other officiants, even if we cannot readily map it on to the Greek perception of a group with non-standard religious beliefs and practices. The unevenness with which data about gods sits across the whole range of written and iconographic evidence reflects a divine demography for which “pantheon”, with its implications of system, is absolutely *not* the right word. And when the landscape is so uneven, we certainly cannot assume that all Persians had the same mental religious map, let alone that any of them were closed maps. Perhaps I over-labour the point, but it is important to grasp that the intimations of mono- or henotheism in royal inscriptions are *entirely* misleading. Persians had no reason to find the variety and varieties of polytheistic religion in the empire a religious problem.

This would not stop them inferring from imperial success that the divine force was largely on their side and that their gods were at bottom stronger than other people’s. Kings certainly believed that, as is clear from royal inscriptions, which assert divine favour, make a special link between King and Ahuramazda (mostly starkly in the proposition “I am Ahuramazda’s, Ahuramazda is mine”) and encode a theology of power in which royal action is framed by cosmic creation and eschatology, disorder is a product of the Lie, and Susa can be assimilated to the “wonder” or “renovation” proper to the Last Days.<sup>357</sup> But this is not a wholly monotheist vision (textually or pictorially<sup>358</sup>), and it neither requires subjects to worship Ahuramazda nor even treats doing so as a metaphor for political obedience.<sup>359</sup> It simply explains the king’s power and provides a transcendent ideological framework for his actions *qua* king. The Persian *ethno-classe dominante* was doubtless aware of this, but it was no more normative for their personal religious behaviour or wider religious perspective than it was for anyone else’s.

Persians *might* act violently against other people’s religious sites and/or their contents. The reasons (when they go beyond the accidents of war) vary in clarity. Temple-burning in Chalcedon was revenge for Chalcedonian destruction of an altar he had erected; a whole set of instances in Asia Minor and Greece responded to Greek destruction of the Cybele sanctuary in Sardis.<sup>360</sup> But the *precise* circumstances of Gaumata’s destruction of *ayadanas* and Xerxes’ of *daivadas* are unknown (the latter are *not* explicitly ones of revolt).<sup>361</sup> The truth about the temples of Egypt in 526-522 or (especially) Babylonia in 484 is contentious.<sup>362</sup> A Hellenistic

<sup>356</sup> There are nearly 40 examples in Persepolis Fortification glyptic: Root 2003, 274. It remains to be seen what connection there is between this phenomenon and a recently discovered Babylonian-style building at Persepolis: see <http://www.beniculturali.unibo.it/it/ricerca/missione-archeologica-congiunta-irano-italiana>.

<sup>357</sup> Lincoln 2012. Susa: DSf§14, DSa§2, DSo§2, DSz§13.

<sup>358</sup> i.e. the Naqš-i Rostam tomb facades.

<sup>359</sup> In DB §§72,75 “they did not worship Ahuramazda” is not a statement of dissidence. In these passages it is the statement that the Elamites / Saka were *arika* that really says this. Their non-worship of Ahuramazda is a foil to the fact that Darius does worship him and therefore enjoys the sort of favour that ensures he defeats them; and the generalizing statement in DB §§73/76 about the benefit of worshipping Ahuramazda is a statement about the advantage Darius gets from doing so, not a suggestion that defeated subjects (or any subjects) should worship Ahuramazda – and therefore get benefits too. (The fact that only the Elamites are said actually to have rebelled makes no difference to the main point about the significance of Ahuramazda.)

<sup>360</sup> Chalcedon: Ctesias 688 F13(21). Anatolia, Greece 499-479: 6.19,31-32,96,101, 8.32,33,53-56,109,143,144, 9.13,65, Aesch.*Pers.*809f, Isoc.4.155f, Plut.*Per.*17, Cic.*Leg.*2.10, *Rep.*3.9,14, Strab.634, Paus.1.16.3,8.46.3.

<sup>361</sup> Ayadana: DB§14. Daivadana: XPh§5.

<sup>362</sup> Egypt 526-522. Thebes (Diod.1.46.4,49.4, Strab.17.1.46, Bernand 1960, 29.8; Hecat.264 F19a), Heliopolis (Strab.17.1.27). Diodorus and Strabo also speak of general destruction / looting, as does

Egyptian trope celebrated Ptolemaic recovery of statues removed from Egypt by the Persians, but the details and truth value of such removal are opaque.<sup>363</sup> It remains worth insisting that, perhaps paradoxically, some such actions can be seen as an affirmation of the value of foreign deities rather than a proof of religious contempt or simple irreligiosity. One could justify taking statues of enemy gods on the grounds that those gods were angry with the misdeeds of their people and need “rescuing” (the same rescue principle applies to royal statues: hence the removal of Darius’ statue from Heliopolis to Susa -- and perhaps of a Xerxes statue from the Bel-Marduk Temple<sup>364</sup>); and an enemy’s affront to one’s own deities (even deities by proxy) can reasonably invite condign revenge.

When Artaxerxes erected Anahita statues in principal cities and taught people to worship her (Berossus 680 F11), he was being proactive, but with an Iranian cult. Persians did not characteristically interfere *proactively* in non-Iranian cults – though the nature of their *reaction* in reactive cases may not always be well recorded. They seem suspiciously easy to manipulate in the Ezra-Nehemiah story; and we do not know what is behind Hananiah’s mission to Egypt or a supposed Persian era reconfiguration of the Cybele altar in Sardis.<sup>365</sup> The Xanthus Trilingual, where the satrap is guarantor for the protection of a new local cult, shows how a satrap might be drawn into a cultic matter – though the Carian identity of the satrap and the cult may make this case unusual.<sup>366</sup> An odd story in Justin 19.1.10-13 about the Carthaginians accepting Persian instruction to stop sacrificing children (and eating dogs) is just that -- an odd story.

Persians could deal robustly with religious institutions in terms of resource management and personnel: we see this in Babylonian archives, Cambyses’ Egyptian temple decree, positive vetting of Egyptian priests (above n.3), the intrusion of Persian temple-managers in Ephesus and Carian Amyzon and, on a massive scale, in the sidelining of a traditional class of priestly families in post-484 Babylonia.<sup>367</sup> They also took Iranian gods with them into the diaspora, though the visible effect is generally small and can be very uneven (it was substantial in Cappadocia-Pontus, significant in Lydia in the shape of Anahita -- and negligible in the rest of western Anatolia). Nonetheless we have various signs of what might be loosely called religious acculturation.

How much personal royal engagement with diverse religious environment is entailed by the notorious Cyrus Cylinder or the Egyptianized identity of Persian kings as pharaohs might be debated. But another Babylonian item is worth note. When an abbreviated version of Darius’ Behistun monument was erected in Babylon, Bel was substituted for Ahuramazda

---

A4.7. Cambyses’ *paranoia* towards temples in Diod.1.95 (which prompted a different attitude from Darius) is unidentified. Removal from temples of silver, gold and ancient documents was predicated of Artaxerxes III in 343, but the loot is supposed to have been returned almost immediately (Diod.16.51.2). Babylonia 484: George 2005/6, 2010, Allinger-Csollich 2011, Heinsch, Kuntner & Rollinger 2011, Henkelman, Kuhrt, Rollinger & Wiesehöfer 2011.

<sup>363</sup> Statue-restoration trope: Winnicki 1994, Devauchelle 1995, Schaefer 2009, 145 n.8 (a new text). P.Vindob. D10,000 II.23-III.1 (Zauzich, P.Rain.Cent. 165ff) is a literary reflection.

<sup>364</sup> Hdt.1.183 speaks of the removal of an *andrias*. Might it have been a royal statue? We now know there was a statue of Darius in the Ebabbara temple at Sippar: BM 72747 (485/4 BC), to be published shortly by Caroline Waerzeggers.

<sup>365</sup> Dusinberre 2013, 234.

<sup>366</sup> FdX vi (translation of all versions: Kuhrt 2007, 859-863). See Briant 1998.

<sup>367</sup> Ephesus: Xen.An.5.3.6 (Megabyzus *neokoros* of Artemesium). A number of later texts indicate the existence of a person named/entitled Megabyzus at the sanctuary at various dates. I assume that all of this reflects the insertion of an Iranian official into temple-management under the Achaemenid dispensation. Amyzon: Robert 1953, nos.2,18. Babylon 484: Waerzeggers 2003/4; Baker 2008.

in the text and a star of Ishtar for the winged disk in the icon.<sup>368</sup> This is much more remarkable than the Cyrus Cylinder – precisely because we *know* Darius had created a new religious-ideological template that was now being locally changed, whereas we *know* nothing about the relation between the Cyrus Cylinder and Cyrus’ ideological discourse in Elam-Persia.<sup>369</sup> We cannot possibly believe the Babylonian Behistun monument was not officially “approved” – the more so as this sort of image was not part of the visual landscape of Neo-Babylonian kingship in Babylon<sup>370</sup> – and we are entitled to follow Bruno Jacobs in viewing this local configuration as a sign of Darius’ belief that “in foreign lands the local gods are powerful”.<sup>371</sup> Exactly the same is true of Darius’ attitude in the letter that warns Gadatas not to upset the priests of Apollo.<sup>372</sup> Xerxes’ belief in the same proposition is visible when the Magi make offerings not only to the wind (a good Iranian deity) but also Thetis and the Nymphs (Herodotus 7.191) or when he himself sacrifices to Athena at Troy (7.43), not as an avatar of an Iranian deity but precisely as the goddess of Troy. That she was also *the* goddess of Athens (where in due course he got Athenian exiles to sacrifice to her: 8.54) and *a* goddess of Sparta (where he hoped Spartan exiles would do the same) is not irrelevant.<sup>373</sup> The principle involved is what underlies Darius’ anger at the fate of the Sardis Cybele temple (5.102). She was a powerful deity in a satrapal city: an offence to her was genuinely a religious offence to the imperial power which was both protective of and protected by her. Nor is it only kings. There was a Cybele shrine in the satrap’s palace at Dascylium (Bakır 2007, 170-1), Datis showed extravagant honour to Apollo (6.97), the younger Cyrus makes Orontes swear an oath of loyalty at the altar of Artemis,<sup>374</sup> Tissaphernes sacrifices to Ephesian Artemis and rallies troops to defend her from Athenian attack,<sup>375</sup> men called Baradates and \*Farnava created cults of Zeus at Sardis and in Cappadocia<sup>376</sup> – and a mid-fifth century Syene garrison commander erected an altar to an Egyptian-named divinity and a novel one at that: not just acculturation but innovation.<sup>377</sup> Persian engagement with Greek religion underlies the Greek concept of “magic”.<sup>378</sup> More

<sup>368</sup> Kuhrt 2007, 158 fig.5.4; Seidl 1998a, 1998b; Garrison (forthcoming [b]), 48. Given the winged disk figure’s significance as a royalty-marker, it does not really matter whether it symbolizes Ahuramazda or something else.

<sup>369</sup> Given the strongly Assyrian character of pre-Darius material (and of the language of PFS glyptic) one might say that the Cyrus Cylinder was quite at home – all the more so if the Babylonian building at Persepolis (n.38) dates from the time of Cyrus, as is being claimed.

<sup>370</sup> Ehrenberg 2008, 109 -- though admittedly from another point of view it is not wholly dissimilar to the Neo-Babylonian royal *stelae*.

<sup>371</sup> Jacobs (forthcoming): “in fremden Ländern die dortigen Götter mächtig waren”. – *Mutatis mutandis* the appearance of *kiten* in XPh<sub>elam</sub> (where Xerxes “placed *kitin*” upon the *daivadana* – i.e. was able to deploy a divine power – normally associated with Humban -- against them) represents a different theology of royal power from the Mazdaean one prevalent in Persian royal inscriptions: another sign of religious diversity.

<sup>372</sup> Meiggs & Lewis 1968, no.12. On the issue of authenticity see Briant 2003, Tuplin 2009.

<sup>373</sup> Xenophon enshrines the principle in *Cyropaedia* when Cyrus engages with the tutelary heroes of Syria (8.3.11-12,24) and gods and heroes of Assyria (3.3.22).

<sup>374</sup> Xen.An.1.6.7. Perhaps this was the archaeologically recovered altar that has been described as a Greco-Iranian hybrid (Dusinberre 2013, 226-7).

<sup>375</sup> Thuc.8.109; Xen.Hell.1.2.6

<sup>376</sup> Zeus of Baradates: Robert 1975; Kuhrt 2007, 865-6. Zeus of \*Farnava: Aydaş 2002, Riel 2003, 97 n.133; Mitchell 2007.

<sup>377</sup> D17.1. See Vittmann 2010, 114-5. The honoured divinity is perhaps called *Wennofernakht* (“Wennefer is strong” or “strong Wennefer”) as is perhaps to be understood as a divinized individual (with an Osiris name).

<sup>378</sup> Bremmer 1994, 84-97, Bremmer 1999.

mundanely, perhaps some of those Persians with Babylonian worship-scene seals actually worshipped Babylonian deities.

Things like this (some of them rather remarkable – more so than their familiarity may make them seem) show the possibility of real religious engagement. Whatever this means at the level of personal religion, it invites us to take seriously the idea that Persians acknowledged the existence, identity and power of deities other than their own. It was not just that, as polytheists, they had no necessary religious problem with their subjects' polytheistic religions. It was that they might reasonably wish the gods of those religions to be a source of benefit, even if, in the event of a clash, they were less powerful than their own gods – and in the event of clash between two lots of non-Iranian gods (as at Elephantine) difficult decisions might have to be made. Their view was that, if the gods of the Babylonians or Egyptians or Greeks or Jews are not against us, they can be/must be for us. The reasons for protecting the interest of foreign gods are not just pragmatic – better tax revenue; avoidance of upset to subjects – but religious. It is, I suggest, in *that* spirit that an accommodation was eventually sought at Elephantine. And it is the reverse of that spirit that, when the Persians disappeared from the scene, the rebuilt temple ended up as living quarters for animals.